

into the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOREMUS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 378) authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Public Health Service necessary tents for use in caring for discharged veterans of the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 379) to increase the salaries of school-teachers and other employees in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 14427) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Malattia; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14428) granting a pension to Julia McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACCRATE: A bill (H. R. 14429) for the relief of Mary O'Grady; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14430) granting a pension to Ezra M. Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14431) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 14432) granting a pension to Solomon Cyr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 14433) for the relief of Harry J. Dabel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 14434) granting a pension to Fred Nilan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14435) granting a pension to Isaac N. Bayless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14436) granting an increase of pension to Lella Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 14437) granting an increase of pension to John Early; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14438) granting an increase of pension to Clara Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14439) granting a pension to Emma Colt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14440) granting a pension to Jesse B. Featherston; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4094. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of National Industrial Conference Board presenting 10 minor amendments to the Federal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4095. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of International Association of Garment Manufacturers of New York, regarding the railroad question; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4096. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Consolidated Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 7204; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4097. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of United Cloth Cap and Hat Makers of North America, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4098. By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: Petition of residents of Madison, Madison County, and Oakland, Burt County, Nebr., favoring passage of Senate bill 3259 and House bill 10925; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4099. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Board of Directors of the Grundy County (Ill.) Farm Bureau, protesting against the Nolan bill for an additional tax on land values; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4100. By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of New York Employing Printers' Association (Inc.), favoring increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4101. Also, petition of sundry citizens and organizations of New York City, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4102. By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of Americans of Ukranian descent, asking for a commission to investigate and relieve suffering in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4103. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Bronx Radical Youth, Branch 548, and the United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers of North America, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4104. Also, petition of Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, favoring increases in postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4105. Also, petition of Wood & Stevens (Inc.), of New York, favoring preference in transportation of tin cans and tin plate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4106. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of William Cluff Co., of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against Capper-Volstead bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4107. Also, petition of Pacific Cotton Exchange, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against tax on stock transactions in bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4108. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Boston Branch Railway Mail Association, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

#### SENATE.

SATURDAY, June 5, 1920.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 2, 1920.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

H. R. 13976. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 13977. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 13978. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

#### CALLING THE ROLL.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gay	Knox	Pomerene
Brandegge	Gerry	Lodge	Robinson
Calder	Hale	McCumber	Sheppard
Capper	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	McNary	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Swanson
Curtis	Kenyon	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Keyes	Page	Warren
Fernald	King	Phelan	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. NEW, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. TRAMMELL, and Mr. WOLCOTT answered to their names when called.

Mr. BORAH, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. REED, Mr. STERLING, Mr. WALSH of Montana, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. SMITH of Arizona entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was a unanimous-consent agreement entered into last night which the Chair is going to violate to the extent of laying before the Senate the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1919, which will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KNOX. In pursuance of the notice I gave yesterday, I offer a resolution amending Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a unanimous-consent agreement now to proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] to discharge the Committee on Finance from the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918.

Mr. KNOX. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. What is the proposed rule?

Mr. KNOX. It is to appoint a committee of three on the revision of the laws to cooperate with a similar committee of the House. I offer it for reference to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. THOMAS. If I remember the proceedings agreed upon last night, we are now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; and the Senator from Pennsylvania is asking unanimous consent. Is there any objection?

Mr. THOMAS. A point of order. Can it be taken up while we are operating under another unanimous-consent agreement? I want to keep faith with the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There seems to be an objection.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object.

Mr. HARRIS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia objects.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the President of the United States having returned to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, the bill H. R. 9783, "An act to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes," with his objections thereto, the House proceeded in pursuance of the Constitution to reconsider the same; and

*Resolved*, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate numbered 30, authorizing the clerk in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, to number the sections consecutively.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1005. An act for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa*;

S. 1222. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*;

S. 3244. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to R. L. Credille, mayor of the village of Bonita, La., in trust, for certain purposes;

S. 3270. An act authorizing the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damages occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases;

S. 3852. An act for the relief of the Garden City (Kans.) Water Users' Association, and for other purposes;

S. 4167. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri;

S. 4435. An act to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America;

H. R. 6407. An act for the relief of Michael MacGarvey;

H. R. 10011. An act authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather;

H. R. 10183. An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10378. An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10806. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved shore spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska;

H. R. 11892. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13627. An act to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines";

H. R. 13962. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 14335. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14338. An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis;

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument marking the starting point of the motor convey from Washington to San Francisco; and

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolution, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On June 4, 1920:

S. 2890. An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes.

On June 5, 1920:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes;

S. 1005. An act for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa*;

S. 1222. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*;

S. 1726. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 2789. An act for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes;

S. 3244. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to R. L. Credille, mayor of the village of Bonita, La., in trust, for certain purposes;

S. 3270. An act authorizing the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damages occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases;

S. 3566. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," approved February 5, 1917;

S. 3852. An act for the relief of the Garden City (Kans.) Water Users' Association, and for other purposes;

S. 3867. An act authorizing the State of New Mexico to apply the proceeds of the grant to said State of 1,000,000 acres of land made by section 7 of the enabling act, June 20, 1910, for the reimbursement of Grant County, Luna County, Hidalgo County, Santa Fe County, and the town of Silver City, N. Mex.;

S. 4212. An act to authorize the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey to construct a bridge across the waters of the Delaware River between the city of Easton, in the State of Pennsylvania, and the city of Phillipsburg, in the State of New Jersey.

S. 4411. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North, at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.; and

S. 4431. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Rock River in Lee County, State of Illinois, at or near the city of Dixon, in said county.

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the compensation of session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives for the month of June, 1920, on the 5th day of said month.

#### INCOME AND PROFITS TAX RETURNS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion of Mr. HARRIS to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from the income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, as I understand, the question now is on the motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, on that question I desire to be heard for a moment.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I wish to say that I shall offer an amendment to the resolution at the proper time making it applicable only to those corporations that earned profits in excess of 20 per cent. Such an amendment will probably reduce the expenses of the investigation.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think first we should dispose of the question of discharging the committee from the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the real question.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] signified on yesterday that he felt fair treatment had not been accorded by the committee to the Senator from Georgia. I do not think that anything could be further from the facts in the case. The Senator from Georgia requested that a committee meeting be called. So soon as that request was communicated to me, although not the chairman of the committee but acting as chairman, I called the committee together and also notified the Treasury Department, who sent an expert to explain the situation and what the resolution would involve in added cost and also in time that would be necessary to obtain the data required.

We heard the testimony and then, in order to facilitate matters, as the testimony was not taken down by a stenographer, I requested the Treasury expert to send up in a condensed form the answers to our suggestions, and to send the matter in as short a space of time as possible. The moment the Senator from Georgia returned, after a short absence, I notified him of what had been done and asked him to examine the letter of the Treasury expert, and also a suggestion which was offered in lieu of his resolution. Therefore, I think we have done everything that could have been asked, but since the matter has been pressed for action, I desire to present the letter which was received from the Treasury Department, and I especially desire the attention of Senators such as the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who has been declaiming against the extravagance of expending \$9,000 in a pension bill, to consider the cost of securing these data and the time involved in doing so, in order that we may vote intelligently upon whether we ought to ask that an expenditure of from \$750,000 to \$1,250,000 be incurred in order to secure data which the Treasury Department can not obtain for us within less than from six to nine months and without seriously affecting other work that it is necessary that they shall perform.

I will now read the letter and shall comment upon some of its provisions while doing so.

Mr. President, let me say in the outset that we should all like the information which is asked for in the resolution, just as we should like other information which we might consider valuable. For instance, I should like to know just what profit every corporation in the United States is making; I should like to know what it is that makes the high cost of living; but the fact that I know that the cost of living is high has not yet suggested to me exactly how I am going to reach the matter and remedy it. So, even though we secure these data at a cost of a million and a half dollars annually and at the expense of a disturbance of the business of the Treasury Department, I do not think—and I speak earnestly and candidly—the information which we should receive would be of the value which the Senator from Georgia attaches to it so far as framing bills in reference to the further taxation of incomes and profits.

This letter is dated May 25, 1920, and is as follows:

HON. PORTER J. McCUMBER,  
Chairman Subcommittee of Committee on Finance,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to your oral request I have the honor to submit estimates of the cost and the time that will be required to prepare the compilation of data to be secured from the income and profits tax returns, as provided for in S. J. Res. 146, which directs the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information from income and profits tax returns for the tax year 1918, as follows: "Capital stock; invested capital; net income; tax (1) income, (2) excess profits, (3) total; per cent of total tax to net income; net income, after deducting tax; per cent of net income to capital stock; per cent of net income to invested capital; per cent of net income, after deducting tax, to capital stock; per cent of net income, after deducting tax, to invested capital; capital stock, 1917; net income, 1917; per cent of net income to capital stock, 1917; the increase or decrease of the per cent of net income to capital stock for 1918 above or below the percentage for 1917."

In addition to the above information, it was suggested that for the 1918 returns there be also shown the amount of gross sales, the gross profits on sales and the per cent of net income to gross sales.

It was requested that the cost be estimated on each of the following plans—

I desire to say to the Senate at this point that we attempted to ascertain whether we could not secure practically the same information asked for by the resolution and if the desire of the Senator from Georgia might not be met with a much less cost and expenditure of time.

It was requested, therefore, that the costs be estimated on each of the following plans:

First, that the returns fall in the same sequence as, and be comparable with, the data given in Senate Document 259, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session.

The Senate have had that document, and they know its extent and volume.

Second, That the required data be compiled from approximately the same number of returns (31,500), but independent of, and not identifiable with, the returns contained in that document. In this alternative plan only returns reporting net income in excess of 15 per cent of invested capital to be included.

The Senator from Georgia suggests that he desires to amend the joint resolution so that it will call for information concerning the returns of only those corporations which reported an income in excess of 20 per cent; but that it will require practically the same amount of investigation, as every item must be returned and examined to ascertain which are above 20 per cent.

Third, That, in addition to the data obtained in the second plan from the returns for 1918, comparable data be obtained from the returns for 1919.

In that connection I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the returns for 1919 will probably not be all in before the 31st day of December, 1920. So we would be delayed until that time before we could begin the consideration of the 1919 items.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The resolution merely asks for information as to the returns for one year. I am quite sure the Senator does not wish to convey an erroneous impression about it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly not. I understand that information is requested as to the returns for 1918. The writer of the letter then proceeds to explain the different plans:

Plan No. 1: The time that would be required to requisition, transcribe, verify, assemble, make the necessary comptometer percentage, and other extensions, and typing the data from these returns is estimated at six months. The returns are in process of audit and distributed among the various audit sections of the unit. It would therefore be necessary to search through these audit sections and through the returns in the process of audit of each auditor for the purpose of transcribing and obtaining the data from them. This would require trained clerks—that is, clerks who by training and ability are capable of identifying the data to be transcribed.

I ask the attention of Senators to the next three or four paragraphs:

It is estimated that the required clerical force, including supervision, would be 440 people, costing \$350,000. The equipment, consisting of comptometers, typewriters, and filing cases, desks, chairs, and miscellaneous office supplies, including transcript cards and tabulation forms, etc., would be \$50,000, totaling \$400,000.

May I take the liberty of pointing out that the tax law has been changed in important respects since 1917, so that, in my opinion, it is not practicable to furnish for individual corporations data that will be exactly comparable with those published in Senate Document 259 referred to above. A large number of corporations have been organized or reorganized in the interval, and in particular a majority of the very large corporations of the country are now required to make consolidated returns, whereas the consolidated return was not accepted for purposes of the income tax under the revenue act of 1917.

Plan No. 2. In 1917 returns for excess-profits tax were made on a form separate from that used in reporting for income tax, only those liable for excess-profits tax using that form, while for 1918 and 1919 income and excess-profits returns were consolidated on one form.

In 1917, therefore, the 90,000 returns to be considered in securing the information called for in the Borah resolution were automatically segregated, while for 1918 and 1919 it will require examination of the 350,000 returns for each year to determine which of them shall be utilized, or at least of a sufficient number to secure the desired 31,500 of usable returns.

The cost, therefore, would be more than for the compilation under plan No. 1. The returns to be used would also have to be transcribed, then segregated according to industries, and the per cent of net income to invested capital calculated for the purpose of selecting the required number of concerns that reported net income of 15 per cent or over on their invested capital.

It is estimated that the clerical force would consist of 520 people, costing \$415,000, and the equipment and miscellaneous supplies \$70,000, totaling \$485,000.

Plan No. 3. As the returns for 1919 are not as yet in Washington, work on the compilation for that year could not begin until they have been received and are available. The clerical cost to cover the compilation of data from the returns for the two years 1918 and 1919 would be approximately twice as much as that for plan No. 2, or \$830,000, and the equipment \$70,000, totaling \$900,000.

Necessary space would also have to be procured for carrying on this work.

I desire to invite the Senate's attention especially to the next two paragraphs:

You have requested to be advised as definitely as possible how much the proposed work would interfere with the regular work of the bureau. An accurate answer to your inquiry is difficult. However, you,

of course, realize that the returns are complicated and that inexperienced employees could not accomplish it in such manner that the results would be of any practical value. In such circumstances it would be necessary to detach a considerable number of experienced clerks and auditors from their regular duties in the audit and other sections in the unit, and require them to train the new employees whose temporary services would be secured for this work.

A few days ago I outlined to the Appropriations Committee of the House when considering the general deficiency bill the necessity for employing additional auditors and clerks in our regular work, and explained to them the difficulty which we are having in securing and retaining the services of competent employees in the bureau, especially in the income and profits tax unit. The fact that the work is not current gives me great concern. It is therefore evident that the interference which this additional work would bring about would be very material. However, I wish to assure your committee that if, in its opinion, this additional work should be done, the bureau stands ready and willing to undertake and perform it.

The cost and difficulty of a report of the kind referred to above are greatly increased when the bureau is instructed either to include all the returns of a specified description, such as all returns showing net income in excess of 15 per cent of invested capital, or to find and match particular returns which have been included in some other investigation. In the first case, every return has to be examined in order to ascertain whether it falls within the designated class. In the second case, much expense and great delay are involved in searching for specified returns distributed among the various divisions in the regular course of audit or for other purposes, although these particular returns may perhaps serve no purpose that would not be as well served by other returns of the same kind or class.

It would be possible at much less cost to take a large cross section or sampling of the returns, fairly representative of all corporations and comprehensive enough to furnish the basis of wholly trustworthy estimates, not only at much less expense but with very much less disorganization of the regular work of the bureau. I have formulated a plan of this kind which would, I believe, furnish all the information desired and which could be carried through at an expense of not to exceed \$250,000. I shall be glad on request to have this plan explained to the committee and would urge its acceptance.

This, Mr. President, presents in a nutshell the serious difficulty we shall encounter in attempting to make this return just at the time when all the clerical force is needed for the investigation and reports upon the tax returns that are coming in from all over the country. I, for one, do not think we are justified at this time in incurring the very heavy expense and much less justified in bringing about the disorganization that will follow an attempt to secure the information required; neither do I believe that it will materially assist us. I think that we ought to give authority by some other law to collect this data and put it in form gradually, as the department is going over the tax returns; and in doing that they can accomplish much more and give us data boiled down so that it will be of some practical use and benefit.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the acting chairman of the Finance Committee as to the date of the letter he has just read.

Mr. McCUMBER. May 25.

Mr. NUGENT. Has any definite action been taken by the Finance Committee relative to the joint resolution?

Mr. McCUMBER. It has been impossible to get the Finance Committee together. I have tried three or four different times to get a quorum and have been unable to secure a quorum. On two or three bills I have tried to poll the committee and was unable even to find a quorum present to poll the committee on most important bills. When one-third of the Senators, or somewhere near one-third of the Senators, are candidates for President and the other two-thirds are looking for a lightning rod, it is very difficult for any of the committees to secure a quorum just on the eve of the national conventions; and I am certain that the Senator realizes that difficulty as much as I do.

Mr. NUGENT. Then, as I understand, no definite action has been or will be taken by the committee during the remainder of the session?

Mr. McCUMBER. They certainly could not take definite action at this time. I allowed the matter to remain in abeyance until the Senator from Georgia returned, hoping that after he had read this letter perhaps he would not consider that the information would justify the cost; and as soon as he returned, as I have already stated, I called his attention to the testimony and to the letter.

Mr. NUGENT. According to my understanding, it would require several months to prepare the information desired by the Senator from Georgia. Let me ask the acting chairman of the committee whether in his opinion the data requested would not be of great advantage to the Finance Committee in writing a revenue bill?

Mr. McCUMBER. I confess that I can not see the great advantage that would be obtained. I think it is quite evident that there have been quite excessive profits; but our revenue laws are graded to cover the excess profits, whatever they may be, and the more the profits the greater the tax. So I doubt very much, if we had the information definitely before us, if it would guide us to any great extent in making any different gradations from what we have now.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me, before he begins, to ask the acting chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I will, with this suggestion: Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the debate on this matter must stop at 12 o'clock. I think it is only fair that we should have an understanding that the time shall be divided between those in favor of and against the motion of the Senator from Georgia. With that suggestion I will yield to the Senator from North Carolina in order that he may ask the Senator from North Dakota a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I did not hear the letter which the Senator read from the Treasury Department; but I understand that the estimate contained in that letter is that the expense of obtaining this data would be about a million and a quarter dollars.

Mr. McCUMBER. If it covered 1919, I think it would. I think the highest figure is placed here at about \$900,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. The highest?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, let me ask the Senator if that \$900,000 estimate is based upon the provisions of the joint resolution as it now reads, or whether it is based upon a proposed amendment limiting the corporation to be selected to those that earn in excess of 15 per cent?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think about \$700,000 covers it as it now reads, and that if it includes the 1919 tax it will come to about \$900,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will recall that in the short session we had about this matter it was suggested by the experts of the Treasury Department that if the joint resolution provided, as the old resolution provided under which we obtained some information heretofore, for the taking of the returns of corporations only whose profits exceeded 15 per cent, the cost would be very much less. Now, I understand that the Senator from Georgia is willing to amend his joint resolution so as to limit it to the corporations whose profits exceed 15 or 18 or even 20 per cent; and that undoubtedly would greatly reduce the cost, because it would greatly reduce the number of corporations whose returns would have to be examined.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; it would not reduce the number that would have to be examined, because every one would have to be examined to see whether it fell within that class, and that is explained in the letter—that you do not reduce the work, because you have got to go through all of them to ascertain which ones have reported an income in excess of 20 per cent and which ones have reported an income less than 20 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was under the impression that one of the experts of the Treasury Department who testified before the committee made the statement that if we selected 31,000 corporations—the same number that was selected in ascertaining the data that we now have—the cost would not exceed \$250,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would very greatly exceed that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, already three-fourths of the time which can be used by the Senate in the discussion of this motion has been used—

Mr. McCUMBER. In getting a quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. There has been a half hour used by those opposed to the motion. There are only 15 minutes left, and therefore I think we ought to permit those who are in favor of the resolution to use some of the time.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to the parliamentary situation. I hope Senators will not become entangled on a question which is not before the Senate, as I look at it. This resolution was submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] many months ago and referred to the Committee on Finance. The committee did nothing until a week or two ago, when the Senator from Georgia made a motion to discharge the committee. At that time it was practically understood that if the motion would not be pressed, the committee would report the next day. The time has gone by, and we are about to adjourn with no report yet made.

The effect of the motion of the Senator from Georgia does not dispose of the resolution. It simply puts it on the calendar of the Senate, the same as though the committee had reported.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the present acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, has given us considerable information, and I confess it is very important and entitled to great consideration. Yet the committee have not reported the resolution. The substance of the letter which was read goes to the expense of getting this information. If the resolution can come before the Senate subject to amendment, as it will be when it is placed on the calendar and called up, we may be able to eliminate a great deal of that expense, and yet not destroy the efficiency or take away the value of the information which it is desired by the resolution to obtain.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is my understanding that the unanimous-consent agreement contemplated not only a vote on the motion to discharge but on the resolution itself.

Mr. NORRIS. No; there is not any such thing in the resolution, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that, but the agreement reported—

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any such thing in the agreement, as I read it at least. If the Senator can find it, I should be glad to see it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be put on the calendar, but as it passed last night it involved, according to my distinct recollection, not only a vote on the motion to discharge, but on the resolution itself; and I think Senators who were here last night will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. NORRIS. I am only discussing it from the RECORD, which is before me, and the RECORD does not disclose any such agreement, and Senators around me who were here tell me that the agreement last night did not actually provide for a vote on the resolution itself; I personally did not hear the statement made last night.

So I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if this motion prevails the resolution of the Senator from Georgia will be placed on the calendar, just the same as though the committee had reported. If all the Senator from North Dakota has said is taken at 100 per cent—and that is the way I am going to take it—it follows, it seems to me, that the Committee on Finance ought to have made a report. Their report would have been adverse, and they have a right to make that kind of a report; but they ought to have reported it back to the Senate.

After months and months of this resolution remaining before them, and after the agreement was had when this motion was brought up once before, it seems to me we are entitled to a report from the Committee on Finance, or we ought to pass this motion and place the resolution of the Senator from Georgia on the calendar.

It is no defense to say that the Committee on Finance can not be gotten together. To my mind that is an argument why we ought to pass this motion and discharge the committee and place the resolution on the calendar. It is an important proposition.

I have felt, and all Senators I know of who have talked with me about it feel, that the information sought by the Senator from Georgia in this resolution will be very valuable, and the country ought to know it. If it is going to cost too much money to get it, that is one of the things we will consider if we ever reach the point of discussing the merits of the resolution.

I do not care to discuss its merits now, but it seems to me that on the face of the record this motion ought to prevail and the proposition be placed on the calendar, where it can be considered on its merits.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. NUGENT. I simply desire to say that this resolution has been pending in the Finance Committee for a very considerable time. I am a member of that committee, and if my recollection serves me right it was not discussed at any meeting of the committee except one held two or three weeks ago, at which time certain information was to be requested in writing from the Treasury Department.

There has been no meeting of the committee called since the date to which I have referred at which this resolution has been considered, and I gather from the statement made by the acting chairman of the committee that no such meeting will be called or held during the remainder of this session.

I fully agree with the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Georgia that the data requested in the resolution of the latter Senator is important. In any event I am quite firmly convinced that he is entitled to have action, either favorable or adverse, taken on this resolution; and, in view of the fact that the committee neither has nor will take such action, I, as a member of that committee, shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Georgia to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution in order that the Senate may have an opportunity to dispose of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hope no one will get the idea that those who favor this motion intend any reflection on the committee. The acting chairman of the committee has explained that he could not get a quorum. He is not to blame

for that. If it can not be had, it seems to me the Senator from Idaho has expressed the attitude which the committee ought to take. If they can not act on a resolution asking for information which has been before them for months, they ought to be willing that the resolution should be placed on the calendar, where it can be considered by the Senate on its merits. That is all this motion would do. I certainly do not want to be put in the attitude of finding fault with the committee for their action or attempted action lately. It seems to me they ought to have taken action months ago on it, but at the present time it would be a physical impossibility to get a quorum of that committee present.

All this motion does is to advance the resolution of the Senator from Georgia to a place where it will be possible to consider it on its merits; then all this evidence and any other evidence will be available. And if we find that the resolution ought to be modified so as to reduce the expense, or even if we want to defeat the resolution, the Senate can take that action. But here is a committee not taking any action. They are in such a condition that they probably can not take any action, and that means blocking the entire matter.

I would be willing to expend considerable money to get this information myself.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would it be possible to consider the question on its merits between now and 4 o'clock to-day, even if we could get it up?

Mr. NORRIS. I am not sure whether it would be possible; but, Mr. President, in my judgment, it does not come with very good grace from a committee to suggest, in substance and in effect, that "we have held this resolution in our pigeonholes for months and months, and now that you have gotten weary of waiting for us, we say to you that, even if you do discharge us and put it on the calendar, we will not have time to consider it."

Mr. McCUMBER. May I suggest to the Senator that it is the same grace which would be required of the Senator, who now, at the very closing hours of the session, desires to bring up a matter when, during all of these months, so far as I know, no one appeared before the committee and asked that it act upon it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. If anyone asked the committee for action upon it during that time, I am not aware of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we had what in substance and effect, as I understood it at the time, was a unanimous-consent agreement at the time the Senator from Georgia first introduced this motion to discharge the committee, and the committee at that time was represented by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who said that he would get the committee together the next day and that we were going to have a report the next day.

Nobody at that time had any objection, as far as he expressed himself on the floor of the Senate, to the resolution itself, and the matter went over, because the members of the committee did not want to be discharged but wanted an opportunity to make a report, which it was expected they would make on the next day.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRIS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield. I think, Mr. President, I had better yield the floor. I do not want to take up all the time, but let somebody else discuss it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I would like to state that the Finance Committee not only agreed to report on it, but I went before that committee and I thought I had a thorough understanding with them as to what the resolution would be and that it would be reported the next day. I was called to my home in Georgia, was gone six days, and was surprised every day not to see this resolution acted upon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last night we were told that the expense of this would be a half million. They have now gone up to \$800,000, covering two years. But there is only one year with which the resolution is dealing. When I have an opportunity to offer an amendment I intend to have it apply only to those corporations earning in excess of 25 per cent. That ought to reduce it so that it would not cost over \$150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator will please excuse me. I must have time to explain my position. If the Senate votes down my amendment allowing it to apply to 25 per cent, I am going to ask then to let it apply to those incomes of \$250,000 and above. If they vote down these two amendments I shall ask that it apply to incomes of \$500,000 and above, and then \$1,000,000 and above; so that the matter of expense will not enter into this, and the Senators voting against discharging the committee will be voting in favor of protection of the profiteers of this country from the publicity which is due to the people.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there are 300,000 corporations, and the estimates from the Treasury Department as to the expense were figured on the whole number. This change will reduce the 300,000 to probably 2,000, and the expense will not be over \$25,000 if it applies to only those earning \$250,000 and above.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRIS. I believe I have taken less of the time of this body than any other Senator. I intend to have a vote to-day on this resolution as agreed upon by the Senate or I will spend all the time allowed me under the rules of the Senate in showing exactly what the report of two years ago contained. It will show the profiteering in this country, and I think it will be interesting. I know the profiteers are opposed to anything like this. They do not want publicity. They do not want the country to know what they did during the war in robbing the people. The magnitude of their unrighteous profits runs into countless millions compared with which the expense of this corrective step is a trifle. One of the profiteers dealing in a food-stuff that enters into the cost of living of every man, woman, and child recently gave \$500,000 to the campaign fund of a candidate for President on the Republican ticket, and they will give millions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Secretary will call the roll on the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] to discharge the Committee on Finance from the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The roll will be called.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ASHURST answered in the affirmative.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll is being called.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think I have a right before the vote is taken to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, when I was not recognized by the Chair until after the roll call had commenced.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "nay."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I am not informed how he would vote on this question, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIAL (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). As announced by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], I have a pair with his colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina]. In the absence of my pair I withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who is not now in the Chamber. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING. I have a general pair for the day with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who is necessarily absent, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. COMER] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I wish to transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and let my vote stand.

Mr. WALSH of Montana (after having voted in the affirmative). May I inquire if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and being unable to obtain a transfer of that pair I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have been unable to obtain a transfer of my pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I desire to announce that if permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. SPENCER. I wish to announce that I am paired for the day with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], but under the arrangement I have with him I feel free to vote on this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I have already voted. I observe that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator. I announce the transfer of my pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and let my vote stand.

Mr. GAY. I am paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. If at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 22, as follows:

#### YEAS—27.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Nugent	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Spencer
Capper	Kendrick	Pittman	Stanley
Culberson	Kenyon	Pomerene	Trammell
Dial	McKellar	Reed	Underwood
Harris	Nelson	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	Norris	Sheppard	

#### NAYS—22.

Brandegge	Glass	New	Smoot
Calder	Hale	Page	Swanson
Dillingham	Harding	Phipps	Thomas
Fall	Keyes	Ransdell	Warren
Fernald	Lodge	Simmons	
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

#### NOT VOTING—47.

Ball	Gay	Lenroot	Shields
Beckham	Gore	McCormick	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Gronna	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Henderson	McNary	Sterling
Comer	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Sutherland
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Townsend
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Wadsworth
Edge	Kellogg	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Owen	Watson
Fletcher	Kirby	Penrose	Williams
France	Knox	Poin Dexter	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sherman	

So the Senate discharged the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of the joint resolution.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11224) to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918.

The message also announced that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the Chair to join a similar com-

mittee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses having completed the business of the present session are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them, and that the Speaker had appointed Mr. MONDELL and Mr. CLARK of Missouri as the committee on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7775) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9281) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11554) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4506) for the relief of Mose Matos;

A bill (S. 4507) for the relief of Jose Salazar;

A bill (S. 4508) for the relief of Simon Florez Cruz; and

A bill (S. 4509) for the relief of Joseph Lago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4510) to amend section 1180 of the Code of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4511) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over certain Government lands to the State of Oregon for the Columbia River Highway; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 14441) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, be taken up and considered by the Senate at this time. I wish to say that—

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose only.

Mr. SMOOT. Was I recognized by the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah was recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to state to the Senate that the House amended the so-called budget bill by inserting the words "appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States," having reference to the comptroller general, but has now agreed to an amendment, and has passed the budget bill now restoring the words "President of the United States," and simply having section 303 read as follows:

The comptroller general and assistant comptroller general shall hold office during good behavior.

The bill has passed the House unanimously, and if it is to reach the President it must pass the Senate at once. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the budget bill be considered at this time. I do not think it will lead to any discussion whatsoever.

Mr. SIMMONS. That removes the constitutional objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I have a copy of the President's veto message here, but it would take too long to read it. However, I will assure every Senator that it does remove the objection offered to the budget bill by the President of the United States. I wish to say that the President desires the passage of a budget bill, and I do not think there is anyone in the United States who does not desire it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the revised measure been submitted to the body at the other end of the Capitol?

Mr. SMOOT. It passed the House unanimously, and if the quorum is broken in the House it can not receive the bill after it passes the Senate. If we can pass it within 10 minutes and get it over there, they can hold the quorum there and the bill will then be ready for signature by the President.

Mr. ROBINSON. Are there any other changes in the bill than the one indicated by the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. Not a word has been changed except as I have indicated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course, a limited opportunity has been afforded Senators to examine the veto message, but relying upon the statement of the Senator from Utah that the sole ground of the veto is the provision that has been changed, I shall make no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have carefully examined the ground of the President's objection, and the changes made by the House do meet the objection of the President. They are the only changes made in the bill as it originally passed the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ASHURST. Let the veto message be read.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not insist upon that. I think all of us understand the ground of the President's veto; that he objected to the bill passed by the two Houses on the ground that the comptroller general, who is appointed by the President, might be removed by a concurrent resolution of Congress.

Mr. ASHURST. There is no use to waste time, but let the veto message be read.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. There is no use wasting time. I want to have the veto message read.

Mr. SMOOT. The veto message is found in to-day's Record at page 8609. I ask that the Secretary may read the message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the message of the President.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my signature H. R. 9783, "An act to provide a national budget system, an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes." I do this with the greatest regret. I am in entire sympathy with the objects of this bill and would gladly approve it but for the fact that I regard one of the provisions contained in section 303 as unconstitutional. This is the provision to the effect that the comptroller general and the assistant comptroller general, who are to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, may be removed at any time by a concurrent resolution of Congress after notice and hearing, when, in their judgment, the comptroller general or assistant comptroller general is incapacitated or inefficient, or has been guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony, or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment. The effect of this is to prevent the removal of these officers for any cause except either by impeachment or a concurrent resolution of Congress. It has, I think, always been the accepted construction of the Constitution that the power to appoint officers of this kind carries with it, as an incident, the power to remove. I am convinced that the Congress is without constitutional power to limit the appointing power and its incident, the power of removal derived from the Constitution.

The section referred to not only forbids the Executive to remove these officers but undertakes to empower the Congress by a concurrent resolution to remove an officer appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. I can find in the Constitution no warrant for the exercise of this power by the Congress. There is certainly no express authority conferred, and I am unable to see that authority for the exercise of this power is implied in any express grant of power.

On the contrary, I think its exercise is clearly negated by section 2 of Article II. That section, after providing that certain enumerated officers and all officers whose appointments are not otherwise provided for shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, provides that the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of department. It would have been within the constitutional power of the Congress, in creating these offices, to have vested the power of appointment in the President alone, in the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, or even in the head of a department. Regarding as I do the power of removal from office as an essential incident to the appointing power, I can not escape the conclusion that the vesting of this power of removal in the Congress is unconstitutional and therefore I am unable to approve the bill.

I am returning the bill at the earliest possible moment with the hope that the Congress may find time before adjournment to remedy this defect.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 4, 1920.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, this is not an attempt to pass the bill over the President's veto?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. ROBINSON. This is an entirely new bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is an entirely new bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. And the bill which is now presented meets the objection which was made by the President in his veto message? The reading of the veto message has confirmed, in my opinion, the statement made by the Senator from Utah. I think the bill ought to pass, although I think that the veto is amply justified as a matter of policy as well as upon the grounds stated by the President. The Congress ought never to have passed a bill of this character authorizing the removal of the comptroller general of the budget by concurrent resolution of Congress. Many of us did not know that there was such a provision in the bill. I have had little opportunity of familiarizing myself with its details; I am surprised to learn that the bill contained such a provision and would have moved an amendment in the Senate if my attention had been called to the provision.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the question that is suggested by the veto message; this bill is so important that it should be passed immediately; but in so voting I still reserve my opinion that the legal proposition upon which the veto is founded is not sound, and that the Congress has the absolute right to do as it proposed to do in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator desire to interrupt me?

Mr. REED. I do not want the matter to go by unanimous consent.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what I was going to say has been very well said by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. I do not desire to stand in the way of the passage of the bill, although I have by no means the enthusiastic view of what the bill will accomplish that other Senators have. I hope for the best, but I, by no means, Mr. President, concede the constitutional question by my vote with reference to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have been, as I said before, working on committees and have been absent during the discussion on some of these bills considered by the Senate, and this is one of those bills. I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if it in any way undertakes to limit or restrict the power of Congress to make appropriations for any purpose whatsoever?

Mr. SMOOT. It does not in any way whatever, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Then what is the object of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. The object of the budget system is to require the President of the United States to submit, and to place the responsibility on him of submitting, each year to Congress a budget of the items which are necessary in order to maintain and operate the Government for the ensuing fiscal year. It also provides that the auditing department, which is now in the Treasury Department of the United States, shall be transferred and operated under the budget system. It also requires the President of the United States to send to Congress an estimate of the revenues of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year.

Congress, then, will have before it, over the signature of the President of the United States, and through him from the executive departments of the Government, a statement of the amount which is required to maintain and operate the Government.

In the past the President of the United States has not had any responsibility in the matter. The heads of departments have made estimates, which have been sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, who transmits the estimates to Congress. Under this proposed budget system the President of the United States will be responsible for the budget, which must be submitted by the 20th of October in the year preceding the fiscal year for which the appropriations for the support of the Government are to be made. After the budget shall have been prepared by the President and sent to Congress, together with the estimated revenues of the Government, Congress then, having all of the information before it, is to act upon the appropriations.

The budget system also provides that there shall be an agency through which Congress may make an investigation into the budget estimates and obtain whatever information it desires as to the real need of appropriations.

I am quite sure that if the bill shall pass it will save many millions of dollars to the Government of the United States. I wish, however, frankly to say to the Senator from Missouri that perhaps the bill is not perfect, but I believe that after it goes into operation if there are any defects found in its workings amendments may be made for the purpose of overcoming such defects.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is there any obligation fixed in the bill upon Congress to appropriate the sums which are estimated for in the budget?

Mr. SMOOT. None whatever.

Mr. ROBINSON. The practical purpose of the bill is to establish a relationship between the revenues and the appropriations and to keep the appropriations within the revenues, if possible?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the object.

Mr. ROBINSON. The power of Congress to appropriate any sum that it seems fit, however, is not restricted in any way?

Mr. SMOOT. As I have stated, the power of Congress in reference to the matter of appropriations is not restricted in any way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I notice that by section 302 the comptroller general and the assistant comptroller general are to be appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say, Mr. President, that that came about in this way: About 2 o'clock yesterday morning there was a bill prepared with the idea of meeting the objections of the President and providing that the comptroller general and assistant comptroller general should be appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States, but when the bill was before the House to-day it was agreed to restore the original language, and that these officials should be appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. That is an improvement in the former bill, I think; but let me say, if the Senator will permit me, that the statement of the Senator from Utah in answer to the query of the Senator from Missouri sustains my previous contention that this budget bill was worthless when we first passed it, it was worthless when it was vetoed, and it will prove worthless when it goes upon the statute books as the result of our vote.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is argued that the pending bill in no manner restricts the freedom of either branch of Congress. It is asserted that it does not in any manner increase the powers of the Executive. I answer, either the bill does something or it does nothing. Upon its face it proposes that the President shall appoint certain gentlemen who will make up for Congress a list of what Congress ought to do in the way of appropriations. If Congress is then perfectly free to act without any limitation of any kind, all that has been accomplished is to lay certain information before the Congress. That information has heretofore for many years been laid before the Congress by the heads of the various departments. If that is all there is to the bill and all that is intended by it, the bill will be, in my opinion, utterly worthless, but probably without any very serious effect.

That, however, is not the purpose of the bill. The purpose is to enable Congress once more to abdicate its powers and transfer them to the Executive. If the Congress of the United States has not sense enough to figure the revenues and arrange a plan for their collection, and then wisely to appropriate them after they are collected, if that work can be better done by the Executive and Congress can no longer be trusted, Congress

had better go out of business; we should once and for all vote our incompetency and shift the responsibility of government to the Executive.

This is no idle thing we are entering upon. For 500 years the one great lever which has been employed by the people of England and later of the United States to maintain the liberties of the people has been the right of the legislative department absolutely to control the finances of the Nation, to raise revenues or not at will, and to expend them at will, subject in this country since its organization to the veto of the President coupled with the right of two-thirds of the Congress to override that veto. We may in the past have proceeded improvidently, but that is no reason for abandoning our duty. It is just as likely that a President, through subordinates whom he appoints and whose word he must take, for he can not study these questions himself, will make mistakes as that the Representatives of the people elected by the people will make mistakes. This is another piece of legislation which arises from the fact that some defects in the administration of a system have been discovered, whereupon it is proposed to change the system instead of improving the administration.

I see sitting back of me the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. On this bill, which had its origin in the disturbed brains of agitators who for the last 20 years have been wanting to change everything in the United States—they are the same class of men who have denounced the Constitution of the United States as out of date, and some of whom would entirely revolutionize our system of government. But I say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I would rather have his judgment as a member of the Finance Committee on what the revenues of the Government should be, and on how they should be expended, than that of any man any President will appoint at any time. I would rather have the judgment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SNODGRASS], who has served upon the Finance Committee for many years, upon the condition of the country's finances than the judgment of any man or any set of men any President will appoint at any time. They are here, close to the problems. They have studied them for many years. They are in touch with the country by reason of their contact with their legislative associates and by reason of their own immediate contact with their own constituencies. They respond, therefore, to the matured will of the country. They are acquainted with its necessities. They may not do everything in a perfect manner, but they will bring to the consideration of the public finances a ripper judgment, a wider experience, a better knowledge, and a higher patriotism than any bureaucracy you may establish, composed of politicians out of a job or of college professors seeking a larger salary.

The reply will be that Congress still controls; but if Congress is still to control, and exercise that control, then the creation of this body is a piece of nonsense superlative. If, by reason of the bill, Congress is to be restricted in any way legally, or if it is to suffer from a moral coercion by the Executive, then, by passing the bill you have transferred to the executive government a great fundamental power of the representatives of the people.

The Executive! We hear nothing but "the Executive." There seems to be an impression that the only department of this Government that functions is the Executive. If there is a difficult task, "Put it on the President." All through the war, if I may use the slang expression—I use it because it is the only expression I know of that covers the case—Congress did nothing but "pass the buck" to the President. When we were puzzled about a difficult problem, the cry was, "Empower the President to do it."

Did the President do it? Not at all. In a few great and important instances his mind was brought to bear upon the question; but in the vast majority of instances when we sent over for the responsible party who was taking the action, we got some clerk out of a department, or some young lawyer who had come to Washington looking for a job because he could not earn a living at home. Yet the acts of these employees were done under the great name of a President. The country was given to understand that the President was doing it.

I do not harshly criticize the departments. They are doing the best they can; but what reason is there that a man who is appointed to some job in one of these departments knows better what to do than the Congress itself? If he were a Member of Congress, you would unhesitatingly dispute his opinion. If he were a Member of Congress, I suppose the press of the country would designate him as a "cheap politician." When, however, he sits down at the other end of this street and puts his legs under a desk in some executive department, he is at once presumed to be in some way or other inspired with divine wisdom and incapable of mistake.

Why should this new bureaucracy be established? Take the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury, in almost all instances, has been a man of ability. He makes his reports to Congress; the Comptroller of the Currency makes his reports to Congress; the heads of all the departments make their reports to Congress, and their requisitions. Are they all to be distrusted? Is their information to be disregarded? If so, then that same information will come to us through this bureau, but subject to its supervision, and probably to a pestiferous and injurious interference.

About all you have to do nowadays in America is to get something with a new name and begin an agitation. Somebody says the United States is spending too much money. Somebody else says the remedy is the budget system. Immediately an agitation begins for a budget system, and all over this country men begin talking about budget systems who do not know what "budget" means, and newspaper editors begin writing about budget systems who would not know a budget if they saw it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. Yes; certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Is it not true that both the Democratic and the Republican conventions declared for a budget system?

Mr. REED. I do not know whether they did or not, and I do not greatly care, for I have seen such platform planks adopted and then I have seen them disregarded by the men nominated upon them, until I have come to believe they are mere devices to catch votes. They are not the declarations of great principles or policies. They are not debated or considered. They count but little. But no man can claim the platform pledged us to adopt this particular budget scheme.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator does not feel that we are bound in any way by the platforms of those conventions?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I suggest that both platforms also pledged the parties to economical administration of Government affairs?

Mr. KENYON. And I will add that the Democratic Party pledged themselves to a living wage for Government employees.

Mr. REED. Yes; at this moment. I think I know a good many things in the platforms of both parties that have been disregarded.

But, sir, this is not a real budget system, if the Senator in charge of the bill has given me a correct diagnosis of it. The name is a misnomer. A budget that amounts to anything is a plan by which there is set down what may be expended and what may be collected. That sort of a system means something; but if you have a piece of paper on which there is set down what you are to expend and what you are to collect, and it binds nobody and has no force or effect, it is not a budget at all; it is a recommendation. If this bill provides for a mere recommendation, it amounts to practically nothing. If it is more than a recommendation, it invades the constitutional power of the Congress. If it is a mere recommendation, you should not call it a budget system. You ought not to pretend that it is a budget.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. The President has power now under the Constitution to make any recommendation respecting legislation he desires to submit, has he not?

Mr. REED. Certainly he has. And Congress has the power to utterly disregard his recommendations if it wishes to do so.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill as carefully as I should like, but I would like to inquire of the Senator from Missouri if it is really anything more than setting up the machinery to advise the President, so that he may intelligently make recommendations to Congress as to what they should do in the way of revenues on the one hand and expenditures on the other?

Mr. REED. I do not know what it is. I do not think anybody else knows what it is. But my opinion is that the real purpose of the bill is to put into the hands of the Executive authority to do something more than to merely recommend. It is intended to create a condition under which a Congressman desiring to urge a fiscal measure can be silenced by the statement "it is not in the budget."

Remember that the power to do a thing right implies the power also to do it wrong; remember that if Congress has made

mistakes in the past, so will the gentlemen who may be selected to make up the budgets make mistakes in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator does not really think we are giving up our constitutional right to make an appropriation, because if that were true the President would object to it for that reason.

Mr. REED. For the reason that Congress was giving up its constitutional right?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That Congress was giving up its constitutional right.

Mr. REED. Has the Senator heard of the President vetoing anything because Congress was yielding its constitutional rights?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was only suggesting a line of thought to the Senator.

Mr. REED. If this bill is to have any effect, it is to constitute a restraining force upon Congress and to put that restraining force in the Executive.

Mr. President, however much we may revere the present occupant of the White House, he can not sit there forever. Indeed, it is universally conceded that in a few months he will vacate that office. Who will come in, high Heaven alone knows. Even the committee on campaign expenses can not make a guess. It may be a Republican; it may be a Democrat; it may be a third party man; it may be a man who bought his nomination; it may be a man who mortgaged his soul in advance to big money—such a man might be interested in arranging a budget which would abundantly take care of his financial friends. I hope we may never have a President of that kind, yet when I find prominent candidates for the Presidency consorting with gentlemen about the underwriting of preliminary campaigns to the tune of \$500,000 per group, I wonder how much freedom of action such a man will have if he be nominated and elected.

When I see another man—Mr. Lowden—going down into his own exchequer for \$400,000, dropping it around in \$30,000 and \$35,000 chunks in the various States, placing it in the hands of practical politicians, and when I see those gentlemen calling in their lieutenants and dividing the swag among them; when I see these paid emissaries slipping about making "a stocking-foot" campaign, their fingers greasy with bank notes; when I see the delegates of a great State elected by such methods; when I see them going to a convention to help nominate for the high office of President the man who out of his own pocket supplied the corruption fund; when I see things of that kind going on I wonder, sir, whether it would be wise to attempt to transfer the powers of the Congress of the United States to the Executive. These processes are boldly defended.

When I find it boldly declared that such a candidate is not culpable because he put up the money himself, I am reminded, sir, of the "Texas Steer," a play which Mr. Hoyt wrote, and which was on the stage a few years ago, and which contains much of human philosophy. Maverick Brander was a rough and ready cattleman of the plains of Texas, with no desire to go to Congress, but his daughter Bossy had an ambition to come to Washington for social reasons, and particularly because she was going to marry a young lieutenant who was about to be sent to Washington. The old gentleman was away on his ranch and Bossy had the right to sign his name to checks. She called in the practical politicians of that district and together they concluded to elect the old gentleman while he was away, without his knowledge or consent. Accordingly they checked out all the money necessary to buy the election. When the old man came home he was indignant. He said he did not want to come to Congress and he would not go to Congress, whereupon Bossy, plaintively exclaimed: "I don't see why dad should not accept the office. I am sure he came by it honestly, because we paid \$5 of his own money for every vote he got."

The political methods and morals of Bossy appear to have been adopted by Gov. Lowden and his friends. The theory is that if a man wants to be President it is entirely justifiable for him to get the nomination by the use of money, provided he supplies it himself.

Incidentally, if it is necessary to have the support of some particularly influential ward committeemen, gentlemen who are to be elected delegates, they may be paid as much as \$2,500 apiece. Such transactions are quite laudable, provided the candidate puts up the money, even though his chosen representative and agent pays it with full knowledge that no part of it will be used in the election save as it gets into the pockets of the delegates. Such transactions have been exposed by the investigation. A humorous phase is imparted by the fact that the gentlemen who took the money found their consciences becoming very acute after the investigation had laid bare the facts, whereupon they came before the committee declaring that they

intend to return the money if they do not deliver their votes for the candidate. They even went so far as to say they will return the money if their man does not win the nomination. Then they add, as a manifest afterthought, that if he is nominated they expect to spend it for his election in the fall. These lofty purposes have already been inspired by the investigation. But, in the meantime, the money is in their private bank accounts, along with their other moneys, and the whole has been checked against in the good old way.

Mr. President, with presidential candidates like that looming big on the horizon and still impudently maintaining their right to submit their names to a great convention, I am not in favor of increasing the Executive power.

It is in evidence that one of these presidential candidates sent his check for \$9,000 to one colored gentleman in one precinct in Georgia. That, I insist, is an unwarranted raising of the market price. The recipient of that fund ought to be arrested under the Lever Act for profiteering.

It is in evidence that prior to a district convention held in a Southern State all the colored brethren were called into a room and "paid off." Shortly after they went into the convention they violated the contract, whereupon the political manager who had paid the money denounced them in open convention as having been guilty of gross fraud, exclaiming, "I bought you fellows and paid you, and now you have gone back on your agreement to vote for a Hitchcock delegation," Mr. Hitchcock being the manager for Gen. Wood.

That testimony was given 8 or 10 days ago and remains unchallenged and undisputed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator also that the same witness testified that he saw \$15,000 in the possession of one of these agents in the South, that it was handed out and shown to him in \$1,000 packages?

Mr. REED. Yes; and in addition to that the witness was offered \$2,000 to withdraw his opposition to Gen. Wood. The inquiry is made here, irrelevantly and quite irreverently, by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] whether they were operating under a budget system; and I answer yes; the moneys had been collected, recorded, and allocated to various States. Even expert accountants had been employed to lay out the book-keeping scheme.

One presidential candidate who looms big on the horizon, Gen. Wood, started his campaign, as I have stated, with a meeting at which he, the candidate, was present. The testimony, undisputed, is that they discussed the question of underwriting \$500,000 at that meeting, and a great railroad president who was there was requested to underwrite the \$500,000.

He declined and the work was assumed by a gentleman who was engaged in manufacturing of a very profitable character. Later on it transpired that they made up a set of books showing \$10,000 had been contributed by this man, that man, and the other, but this did not cover the money. When we sought for an explanation we found that one of these men had "loaned" to the campaign committee, of which he was substantially the whole, approximately \$700,000. He transacted the business with himself, making the loan from himself to himself as the manager. No one, according to his testimony, had ever agreed to pay it back. Later on we found they had resorted to the miserable subterfuge and cover of taking alleged promissory notes, signed: "The Campaign Committee, by So-and-so, treasurer." Sometimes the note was signed by the treasurer and sometimes its clerk, if I remember correctly.

This Wood fund has already reached the stupendous total of about \$1,600,000. When I find operations of that kind going on and men of that kind, even after exposure, still demanding nominations, and likely to get them, I think it is just as well to do as our fathers said we should do, keep the powers of the Government divided and its responsibilities separated. Let Senators take their share, the Congressmen take their share, the President take his proper share, the heads of departments take their proper share, all together, and the Government will be safe. Any other course is full of peril.

Mr. President, I somehow or other feel that I ought to stand here and talk this bill to death. I am not going to do it because there are other matters pressing for attention. I have said this much because I think it ought to be said.

I want Congress to retain its power. I do not believe, sir, that the President of the United States is thereby created the head of a political party. I do not believe he has any right to interfere in politics, once he has been elevated to that high position. I think he ought to be President of the United States. Charged as he is with a great trust, the greatest trust of power ever conferred by a free people, he should justly and impartially exercise that power in the clear, full light of disinterested statesmanship. He ought not to be writing platforms for

parties, interfering with the people's elections, or seeking to dictate the course of all public events. Sitting in his high position, clothed with grave powers, and bearing great responsibilities, he ought to observe the impartiality of a great judge, whose ermine is unspotted by corruption and unstained by interest, passion, or prejudices. That, sir, is my conception of the great office of President. Its occupant ought to be nominated by the voices of the people, uninfluenced and unbought. In his election there should be employed no means save an honest appeal to reason and hearts of his fellow countrymen. Enormous campaign funds are as disgraceful in national politics as they are in the corrupt wards of a corrupt city. They serve no useful purpose. They taint the office and they debauch the title of its occupant.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I have favored the budget plan for years. I supported this measure in the committee. The people of the country realize since they have paid direct taxes that they should get some means to check the enormous Government expenditures.

I wish to read from one of the appropriation bills. This is a bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

In the Senate provision is made for compensation of Senators \$720,000; for mileage of Senators, \$51,000; and—

For compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others:  
Office of the Vice President: Secretary to the Vice President, \$4,000; clerk, \$1,600.

I think we ought to have given the clerks that extra month. They are poorly paid and it is our duty to do this.

Telegraph operator, \$1,500; page, \$600.

They ought to receive twice that.

Chaplain, \$1,200.

He ought to be given five times that.

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500.

Henry M. Rose, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,250; principal clerk, enrolling clerk, and printing clerk, at \$3,000 each; reading clerk, \$4,000; financial clerk, \$4,000; librarian, etc.

Clerks and messengers to the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Appropriations—clerk, \$5,000; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,500 each; 3 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,600; assistant clerk, \$1,500. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each. Claims—clerk, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,500 each.

I was very much interested in one item I was trying to find here, but I do not see it now.

Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds: Chief engineer, \$2,160; assistant engineer and electrician, \$1,800; 3 assistant engineers, at \$1,440 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$1,200.

For the Senate Office Building, under the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, subject to the control and supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules: Fourteen elevator conductors, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$16,800.

Capitol police: Captain, \$1,800; 3 lieutenants, at \$1,200 each; 2 special officers, at \$1,200 each; 47 privates, at \$1,050 each; 10 additional privates, at \$840 each; one-half of said privates to be selected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and one-half by the Sergeant at Arms of the House; in all, \$65,550.

For contingent expenses, \$200.

Joint Committee on Printing: For clerk, \$4,000.

I call attention of the Senate to this. A great many Senators believe in economy until it comes to their own committees. Here is the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, of which Senator Smoot is chairman, whose salary was increased from \$3,000 to \$4,000. They reduced a number of salaries of other clerks.

Legislative drafting service: For salaries and expenses of maintenance of the legislative drafting service, as authorized by section 1303 of the revenue act of 1918, \$40,000, one-half of such amount to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

House of Representatives: For compensation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, and the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands, \$3,304,500.

For mileage of Representatives and Delegates and expenses of Resident Commissioners, \$175,000.

For compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others:  
Office of the Speaker: Secretary to Speaker, \$4,000; clerk to Speaker's table, \$3,600, and for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$1,000 per annum; clerk to Speaker, \$1,600; messenger to Speaker, \$1,440; messenger to Speaker's table, \$1,200; in all, \$12,840.

Chaplain: For chaplain, \$1,200, and \$600 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Office of the Clerk: Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; hire of horse and wagon for use of the Clerk's office, \$1,200, or so much thereof as may be necessary; Chief Clerk, \$4,500; Journal clerk and two reading clerks, at \$4,000 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,400; tally clerk, \$3,300; file clerk, \$3,250; enrolling clerk, \$3,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; chief bill clerk, \$3,000; assistant to Chief Clerk, and assistant enrolling clerk, at \$2,500 each; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,400; stationery

clerk, \$2,200; librarian, \$2,100; assistant librarian, \$2,100; assistant file clerk, \$1,900; assistant librarian, messenger and assistant Journal clerk, at \$1,800 each; clerks—one \$1,800, three at \$1,680 each; book-keeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,600 each; four assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,500 each; stenographer to Clerk, \$1,400; locksmith, who shall be skilled in his trade, \$1,300; messenger and typewriter repairer in Chief Clerk's office, and assistant in stationery room, at \$1,200 each; messenger in file room—

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the passage of the budget bill the Senate joint resolution 146 be taken up for consideration and a vote be taken upon it 15 minutes after it has been presented to the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. What is Senate joint resolution 146?

Mr. SMOOT. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], from which the Committee on Finance was discharged this morning.

Mr. POMERENE. I will object at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall object at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Objection is made and the Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. HARRIS resumed his speech, and after having spoken for a few minutes,

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. GAY. I will not ask the Senator from Georgia to yield the floor to me except for a few moments, for the purpose of enabling me to make a statement.

Mr. HARRIS. I take pleasure in yielding to enable the Senator to make a statement.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, yesterday, late in the afternoon, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] asked unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate bill 4420, a bill which seeks to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes. To that request I made objection; and right here, Mr. President, I wish to explain the parliamentary situation as it existed at that time. The Senator from Oregon, having secured recognition and having made his request for consideration of the sugar embargo bill, was interrupted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who desired to bring before the Senate the joint resolution repealing war legislation. I favored this joint resolution, and only regret that it did not go further and repeal all of the war legislation on the statutes. The Senator from Oregon would not yield to the request of the Senator from South Dakota unless he could get the assurance of the Senate for unanimous agreement to place the sugar embargo bill as the business before the Senate immediately after the consideration of the joint resolution, and as I was unwilling to do this, my opposition might be construed by some as also being opposed to the joint resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota. I make this preliminary statement in order that there may be no misunderstanding.

Mr. President, the bill proposed by the Senator from Oregon seeks to violate every law of equity and every law of supply and demand. Such powers as this bill proposes are only for use in times of national defense as a war measure under dire distress or emergency.

Like the rifle and the bayonet, it has its place and use in war, but in times of peace such a measure is abhorrent, un-American, and unjust. The majority in Congress, having signally failed to offer constructive legislation, now seeks by obstructive methods to upset all recognized sound and sane rules of commerce in the hope of fooling the people into believing that they are making an effort to relieve a situation caused largely by their inaction and inefficiency.

This bill, if passed, can not and will not reduce the price or increase the supply of sugar to the American consumer. It is simply an attempt to divert the thought of the Nation from the effect of what has been to a new hope of what may be.

Consuming foreign nations are invited by this bill to take over the refining capacity of America, to launder their sugars for them; producing foreign nations to sell their raw product to every country except America, knowing that the American refiner will welcome and give preference to this business because he is unrestricted in the extra profits which he can charge for refining.

This is an attempt at class legislation in the rankest form. First, it turns over to foreign nations all the refining capacity of America they desire to use, making the foreigners a preferred customer. Nothing but the limitation of money or his buying ability would prevent the foreign speculator from buying up the sugar crop, having it refined in America, shipped abroad, and reshipped to America at a large profit. He does not even

have to reship it. He can store it and hoard it in this country for higher prices.

Second, it says to the refiners, "Here is preferential business for you." Mr. President, I say here and now that this bill bears all the earmarks of a refiners' bill. Here is a law under which you can give preference to foreign-grown sugars bought for foreign account, refusing to buy or refine the sugar of continental America, Porto Rico, and Hawaii, because if you do refine these sugars of American origin, you can not export them.

Sugar brought into this country and refined for domestic use must be refined on a margin of 2 cents per pound, while sugar brought in by foreigners and refined on a toll basis has unlimited margin, and a refiner is at liberty to charge any price he pleases.

Therefore the refiner, in whose interest the bill seems to be framed, will cater to foreign trade.

Third, it is ranker class legislation in that it singles out one great American product, leaving those of equal or greater importance, as measured by the family budget, free and unrestricted. Sugar is not the only product or the only food necessity in America which is being exported to-day. It is not even the greatest in volume or value, and there is not a pound of American sugar being exported, as the authors and advocates of this measure well know, and it will not help the American public one iota. It is simply an attempt to deceive the people, as we have seen so often in this Congress, particularly by those who have tried to make politics out of the economic conditions of the day.

If this embargo on the exportation of sugar is to be such a boon to the American people, why not add to their supply and saving by an embargo on other commodities?

The increase in the exports of foodstuffs other than sugar is simply astounding. I quote here from the report of the Department of Agriculture as printed in the Year Book for 1919. Under the heading "Exports" we find the following:

#### EXPORTS.

The exports of foodstuffs, enormous during the war, rose greatly between the armistice and midsummer. The annual average exports of important cereals for the five years preceding the war were 162,000,000 bushels. They rose to 517,000,000, in 1915, and aggregated 448,000,000, in 1919. Dairy products, of which 25,000,000 pounds were exported on the average during the five-year period before the war, increased in volume to 102,400,000, in 1915; 217,500,000, in 1916; 352,000,000, in 1917; 592,000,000, in 1918; and 781,000,000, in 1919; while the exports of meat and meat products were 1,291,000,000 pounds for the five-year average before the war; 1,500,000,000, in 1915; 1,800,000,000, in 1916; 2,300,000,000, in 1918; and 3,300,000,000, in 1919.

Thus the annual average export of cereals just preceding the war was 162,000,000 bushels, while in 1919, during peace, we find the cereal exports amounting to 448,000,000 bushels, or 176 per cent.

The five cereals segregated show an amazing increase in exports for 1919 over that of the prewar period. The export of wheat averaged during the period from 1910-1914 less than 57,000,000 bushels, while the year 1919 showed an export of wheat amounting to nearly 180,000,000 bushels, or an increase of 313.8 per cent.

Wheat flour in the average annual prewar period ending with 1914 was exported to the amount of 10,000,000 barrels, while in 1919 over 24,000,000 barrels of wheat flour were shipped from America, an increase of 226.5 per cent. The other cereals in the list were in percentage of increase for 1919 over the average five years' prewar period ending 1914.

The following table from the records of the Department of Commerce is very enlightening:

#### Exports of domestic foodstuffs from the United States.

Reports of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce.)

Article exported.	Annual average, 1910-1914.	Year ending June 30—					
		1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	
						Amount.	Percent of 1910-1914.
Wheat.....bushels	56,913,228	259,642,533	173,274,015	149,831,427	34,118,853	178,582,673	313.8
Wheat flour.....barrels	10,678,635	16,182,765	15,520,669	11,942,778	21,880,151	24,190,092	226.5
Oats.....bushels	8,304,203	96,809,551	95,918,884	88,944,401	105,881,233	96,300,974	1,160.4
Rye.....do	854,765	12,544,888	14,532,437	13,260,015	12,065,922	27,540,188	3,222.3
Barley.....do	7,895,521	26,754,522	27,473,160	16,381,077	26,408,978	20,457,781	259.1
Corn.....do	39,809,690	48,786,291	38,217,012	64,720,842	40,997,827	16,687,538	41.9
Total 5 cereals, including flour.....do	161,831,264	517,360,227	419,258,518	386,880,263	317,933,492	448,484,568	.....

As we follow these reports and bring them up to date, we find from the records of the Department of Commerce that for the 10 months ending with April, 1920, the exports of wheat and wheat flour were—wheat, 98,720,260 bushels, valued at \$238,202,886; wheat flour, barrels, 16,333,889, valued at \$181,227,438.

Evidently there is no decline in the amount of cereals and breadstuffs leaving American shores even if the price does continue high. If an embargo on exports of one essential food supply is the remedy for the shortage or the cure for high prices, why not do greater good by extending to all the essential foods? What would be the price of flour and bread in the family budget of the American family if an embargo was placed on the export of wheat and flour? If this bill be the remedy, why not be sincere and render a real service to the American people by including wheat and wheat flour together with all the other important cereals named? Failure to include these puts the stamp of insincerity on the authors and sponsors of this bill.

The average prewar annual export of dairy products was 25,000,000 pounds, and this increased in volume in 1919 to 781,000,000 pounds, or 3,024 per cent. How about the supply and price of butter, which the Department of Agriculture says was normally about the same annual cost to the American family as sugar?

The prewar annual export of meat and meat products was placed at 1,291,000,000 pounds. There were exported in 1919 3,300,000,000 pounds of meat and meat products, or an increase of 255 per cent. The average American family used 800 pounds of meat per year in normal prewar times. Why not an embargo on meat and meat products, an article ten times as great in volume and equally as great in demand on the family budget as sugar? If an embargo on sugar is such a panacea, such

a sure way to supply all the people of America with all the sugar they want at as low a price as they want it, why not multiply the satisfaction of the appetite and the saving of money by an embargo on meat and meat products?

It will be contended that America must supply herself largely with sugar grown on foreign soil, while the items already named are chiefly American grown. This is true in part only, but granting the contention, so much more the reason for the inclusion of these. We already have them; it would be good policy then to keep them.

Now, what about hides, leather, and shoes? I quote from the Agricultural Yearbook for 1917, as follows:

The consumption of calfskins was 49 per cent greater than their production in 1900, and the deficiency increased to 1915, for which year the consumption of these skins was 179 per cent greater than the production.

Cattle hides show the same trend; in 1900 the consumption was only 6 per cent greater than the production, and the deficiency increased until 1915, when the consumption was 78 per cent greater than the production.

Again, in the case of sheepskins, the consumption for 1900 was 33 per cent greater than the production; for 1914, 54 per cent greater; and for 1915, 109 per cent greater.

Thus for many years the production of hides and skins in this country has played a losing part in its efforts to meet the demands of consumption, and during all these years this country has been growing more dependent on foreign countries for its hides and skins, and consequently for its leather.

Here is an article for which America is dependent on foreign supply, yet notwithstanding this fact we are exporting enormously hides, leather, and shoes. In the 10 months ending April, 1920, we exported 19,248,842 pounds of hides and skins, valued at \$8,919,572, an increase of nearly six times in poundage and value over the corresponding period of the previous year.

The export of leather for the 10-months' period ending April, 1920, shows a total value of \$179,395,102, to which we must add manufactures of leather for the same period of 10 months, \$74,558,338; while during the same period we exported shoes to the total amount of 16,601,854 pairs, valued at \$63,441,630. This is on an article very largely derived from imported raw material. Why not include in this bill hides and skins, leather and manufactures of leather, boots and shoes, limiting the exportation to that imported and manufactured on toll for the foreigner?

If this bill be the remedy, why try to have it sugar-coated? Make it real by putting an embargo on all leather and leather products.

To be fair and impartial let us include wool, another article which we import and for which America is paying a very high price.

For the nine months ending March, 1920, we exported wool products to the amount of \$43,261,919, while for the corresponding nine months' period in 1919 we exported \$19,049,419, an increase of 130 per cent in 1920 over a corresponding period the year previous.

From all parts of the country come reports of overall clubs being formed. Do not these reports remind you that the people are thinking of the price of wearing material? Might not an embargo on the export of manufactures of wool tend to increase the supply and reduce the price of clothing?

With these facts before you, if you really believe that an embargo on essentials will solve the problem of supply and reduce the cost of living, amend your bill to include wheat and wheat products, meat and meat products, hides and leather, boots and shoes, and wool and wool products.

Failure to include these—all of them equaling and most of them exceeding sugar in importance when measured by the national requirement or by the family budget—will stamp your sugar embargo bill as an attempt at rankest class legislation, insincere, and for political propaganda only; an abortive attempt to divert the eyes and minds of the American people from inability to build constructively in your legislation, and by obstructive methods to continually agitate the business of the country, creating a condition of distrust and uncertainty, which means that the consumer, the great American householder, and none other, will pay the cost as they are doing to-day.

The object of this bill seems to be to encourage American refiners to do business with foreigners instead of trying to benefit the American consumer, and to place the title to all sugars coming into and going out of the United States in the hands of foreigners.

Regulations have made it more profitable to sell abroad than in this country. Your embargo would not stop foreign business so long as the American refiners can refine sugar on toll for foreign account. You can not get away from the law of supply and demand, which will flow over or under or around in some direction. This embargo is an attempt to put in another dam and try to stop the flood in another place. It will only result in changing the channels of trade and will not result in any more sugar being made in Cuba or any less sugar being consumed in England, France, or any of the foreign countries who have been having their sugar refined in this country. The bill is purely demagogic, and in line with most of the other legislation advocated by its proponents.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as there has come a momentary pause, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Louisiana if they will not permit a 10-minute executive session? It is a matter of perfect indifference to me personally; but many Senators on the other side of the Chamber have asked for a brief executive session in order to have confirmed a number of pending nominations in which they are very much interested. I should like to make the motion, and after the executive business has been transacted, when the Senate resumes its legislative session, the Senator will still hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. HARRIS. With the understanding that I will hold the floor I am willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, the Senator will hold the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to state first, however, since the Senator from Massachusetts has made the request, that the reason why I agreed the other day to let the vote on the joint resolution go over was because the Senator from Massachusetts, the leader of the majority party, suggested that it go over and that there would be a vote on it. I think if the Senator will look at the RECORD he will find that to be the case.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to a vote, Mr. President. I knew there were some amendments to be made to the joint resolution which I understood had not then been prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia yields for the purpose suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts without prejudice to his right to resume the floor when the Senate returns to legislative session.

Mr. LODGE. That is understood.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7775) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. KING conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9281) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. KING conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. KING conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11554) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. KING conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### PROPOSED SOLDIERS' BONUS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARRIS. I take pleasure in yielding to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. The House has recently refused to permit any extensions of remarks in the RECORD relating to the subject of the bonus, which, among other things, excludes documents referring to that subject from introduction into the RECORD by

Members of the House. I hold in my hand a letter written to the Hon. JULIUS KAHN on the 24th day of May, 1920, and signed by Fred Searls, jr., relating to this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Secretary to read it.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield long enough for the Secretary to read it?

Mr. HARRIS. What is it?

Mr. THOMAS. It is a letter which I offer for insertion in the Record.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the Senator from Georgia run any risk of losing the floor by yielding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless the point is made, the right of the Senator from Georgia to the floor will not be prejudiced by his yielding upon the request of Senators.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the point is made, the Chair will give information of the fact to the Senator.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Under no circumstances would I attempt to take the Senator from the floor; I can assure him of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator—that the Secretary read the communication?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., May 24, 1920.

HON. JULIUS KAHN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an ex-service man who spent two full years with the A. E. F. in France and Germany, the writer has been interested in the conduct of the various proposed measures for soldier relief in the Congress. He desires to take advantage of his position as one of your constituents to express one or two opinions which he believes from conversation with other ex-service men are more commonly held and less frequently urged than the attitude of a certain rather active element in the American Legion.

The writer knows that a large number of ex-service men would be reluctant to see any of the proposed measures pass, because of a curious feeling—which the writer shares—that their enactment would in a way cheapen our service. It is beyond the power of the Congress to reward the ex-service men who made the greatest of all sacrifices, and some of us who number good friends and comrades amongst them, and who saw them fall and suffer, feel that we would in some intangible way lose something of the satisfaction of having been with them and carried on their attempt if we received a reward which they can not share.

This consideration is a purely sentimental one, of course, but it is commonly, if not generally, shared. Another reason why the writer personally feels opposed to all relief measures is that he does not believe that the service men have any reward coming. He holds that it is the duty of the young men of this country to protect it when necessity arises, and while they may perhaps be entitled to the gratitude of the Nation for having performed their duty moderately well, it was nevertheless their duty, and its consummation places no obligation of financial reward upon the public.

The third reason why the writer as a citizen is opposed to any bonus plan is that he is convinced, after two years' service as a private, noncommissioned officer, and lieutenant, that the payment of a bonus will in the aggregate have no helpful result in bettering the condition of ex-service men generally. These men, after two years or less separation from their former employments must, sooner or later, find a new niche or their old one, and settle down to work as ordinary civilians. No inconsiderable part of the unrest and abnormal labor conditions has been the direct result of the disturbance engendered by this readjustment, and the writer feels sufficient acquaintance with the A. E. F. personnel to venture the considered opinion that the payment of a cash bonus will only make the readjustment harder, prolong the period of no certain occupation, and without creating contentment, contribute directly, as well as indirectly, to idleness, nonproduction, and reluctance to settle down to normal industry.

These reasons alone appear to the writer to dictate opposition to any of these proposed measures, and when to these considerations is added a proper detailed appreciation of the burden which any adequate legislation of the kind proposed would

place directly or indirectly on the public—and it is on the public that it must ultimately fall, let the Congress frame it as they will—it appears to the writer that a patriotic citizen with the country's welfare at heart must oppose these measures with the same interest that he supported the war.

The writer thinks that opponents of these bills who were not themselves overseas labor under the disadvantage of being possibly stigmatized as ungrateful or lacking in appreciation of the sacrifices made by the troops, and the hardships and peril to which they were subjected, or of being accused of even more objectionable motives. It is for this reason that he quits the attitude of silent disapproval held by a large proportion of ex-service men to state that he ceased lucrative employment for a private's pay, that he took his chances with the First Division, and that he has resumed civilian employment, and wishes nothing more from the United States than the right to be one of its citizens. It is his earnest belief that you will best forward the interests of the Nation, of the American Legion, as well as the legion of other Americans, if you oppose the passage of any further bonus for ex-service men whose abilities are unimpaired by their service. As to the Nation's obligation to the permanently disabled, there can be no difference of opinion amongst real Americans.

Sincerely, yours,

FRED SEARLS, JR.

#### INCOME AND PROFITS TAX RETURNS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senate is familiar with Senate joint resolution 146. There are two amendments to it. It will not be necessary to have a yea-and-nay vote. We can dispose of it within six or eight minutes; and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate joint resolution 146.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that unanimous consent can not be granted as long as there is a question pending before the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask, then, unanimous consent to lay aside the pending matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, why not ask unanimous consent that this be done immediately after the passage of the budget bill? There is no need of displacing the budget bill now with another motion. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be taken up and voted upon immediately after the budget bill is passed.

Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will assure me that there will be no further discussion of the matter—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think we all agree that the Senator from Georgia ought to have a vote upon his joint resolution. It has been pretty thoroughly discussed. All the objections to it have been pretty generally stated. I feel that we ought not to prevent his getting a vote. I sincerely hope the Senator from Utah will not object to the request of the Senator from Georgia for unanimous consent for an immediate vote on the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand the Senator does not ask for a roll call.

Mr. HARRIS. I stated that I would not ask for a roll call.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator stated that he would not ask for that.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I want to know only one other thing. I want to know whether, if this resolution is acted upon, whether the action be favorable or unfavorable, we then can take up the budget bill, and there will be no objection to its passage?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I stated I had no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. What I want is to be sure there will be no objection to it.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to make this suggestion, that the Senator from Georgia yield the floor, so that we can vote on the budget bill, with the understanding that he can resume the floor immediately thereafter.

Mr. SMOOT. I would be glad to do that.

Mr. POMERENE. I am anxious to get the budget bill out of the way if it is possible, and I do not mean that by reason of action thereon the parliamentary status, so far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned, shall be changed.

Mr. SMOOT. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. POMERENE. There are several other matters some of us are interested in which we would like to bring to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not want Senators to assume that there will be no objection to the consideration of this joint resolution when it comes up or to any unanimous consent for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent. He is entitled to submit his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand the point of order was made that there is another matter pending, and that unless the floor is yielded for that purpose the unanimous-consent request can not be made at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the Senator can submit a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. It all depends, Mr. President, upon how the unanimous-consent request is framed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think that a technical suggestion of that sort would preclude the Senator from Georgia, in view of all the circumstances connected with the present situation, from submitting his request for unanimous consent that the pending measure be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 146, to a vote viva voce upon all amendments which may be offered, and a final vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall not ask a roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated that the vote would be viva voce.

Mr. HARRIS. A division, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Viva voce or by division.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement if we can have an understanding now that the budget bill will be taken up and that no objection to the passage of the same will be made, because if objection is to be made we might just as well go on with the budget bill. The Senator from Georgia, I think, will approve of that course.

Mr. HARRIS. I approve of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is also made that immediately following the vote upon Senate joint resolution 146 the Senate will proceed to a vote upon the so-called budget bill.

Mr. REED. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri objects to the modified request.

Mr. REED. I do not object to the first request, but I object to the qualification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is entitled to have submitted his request for unanimous consent to vote upon Senate joint resolution 146 without the qualification.

Mr. KENYON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to inquire what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the budget bill, the Chair understands it.

Mr. KENYON. How did that get before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it was reported from the appropriate committee, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration by unanimous consent, the Senator from Georgia yielding for that purpose.

Mr. KENYON. I am for the budget bill, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has objected to unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has objected to the unanimous-consent request as modified, but the Senator from Georgia modified his request at the suggestion of other Senators, and now desires to submit his original request for unanimous consent that the pending measure, the budget bill, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 146 to an immediate vote thereon, together with all amendments, a vote viva voce or by division, without roll call. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McCUMBER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota objects. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I want to read a statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on May 21, when the joint resolution was being considered by the Senate:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I can see no possible reason why the joint resolution should not be passed. It seems to me a perfectly proper one. I understand the Committee on Finance had a meeting this morning for the purpose of reporting it out and intend to have another meeting tomorrow to report it out. There is no opposition to it. It appears to me to be rather unnecessary to treat the committee in this way. I do not think it would facilitate the passage of the joint resolution particularly. I think it ought to be brought out to-morrow and disposed of.

On that statement, Mr. President, I let the matter go to the committee. I have no criticism of the acting chairman of that committee. I think he is one of the best men in public life in the United States. I have the greatest admiration for him and for the members of the committee.

I move again, Mr. President, the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I made the objection more particularly because I thought the Committee on Finance was unjustly and unfairly assailed by Senators upon this floor with reference to its action upon this particular measure. I know there has been no ground whatever for censure of that committee. It has acted fairly, and as soon as the matter was presented for consideration the committee was called together and testimony was taken. We had to wait a day in order to get a report; the Senator from Georgia was then absent; new matters were presented which I felt the Senator from Georgia was entitled to consider before the Senate committee should act upon it; and as soon as he returned, Mr. President, we called the committee together.

Now, Mr. President, with that statement I withdraw my objection to the unanimous-consent agreement.

#### MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate on a previous day entered a unanimous-consent order that at 2 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of June 5, 1920, the Senate would proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill referred to under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill just reported. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to submit a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the creation of this commission, and I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending bill and to have a vote, without discussion, upon Senate joint resolution 146.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I am sure it was the general understanding when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into that we would not take the time of the Senate this afternoon on the bill. The object was that the bill should be before the Senate at the time of adjournment, so that it would become the unfinished business. That was the general understanding, and I want thoroughly to carry it out. So I am ready, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] joins me, at any time to temporarily lay aside, by unanimous consent, the bill now before the Senate if there is other business of the Senate that any Senator may desire to call up, with the understanding that the bill shall be restored to its place as the unfinished business before the hour of 4 o'clock.

#### INCOME AND PROFITS TAX RETURNS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 146 and, without debate, to a final vote upon the resolution with all amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have no objection to laying aside the bill, but I shall object to the request made by the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, Mr. President, I move—

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know that I understand the Senator from Utah. I had understood that the Senator was perfectly willing to grant unanimous consent to take up the joint resolution in charge of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to take up for consideration the joint resolution of the Senator from Georgia if it is going to lead to no debate, but I couple with that the request that immediately after action upon it by the Senate the Senate shall take up the budget bill and vote upon that without any further debate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am at a loss to understand why the Senator from Utah wants to couple the budget bill to the request of the Senator from Georgia. If the Senator from Georgia can get unanimous consent and we can have a vote on his joint resolution, then it seems to me the budget bill would be in a

better situation than it is now, with the Senator taking up the time of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think so.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is very wrong in not thinking it.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not see it as the Senator sees it; that is all. I am told that there are two Senators who are going to object to the consideration of the budget bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know whether they are or not.

Mr. KENYON. How can the Senator expect to get the consent of the Senator from Georgia by tying up his proposition with the budget bill?

Mr. SMOOT. We might just as well have it tied up with the budget bill now as to have it tied up at any other time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. It seems to me the attitude of the Senator from Utah is one of hostility to the consideration of the budget bill, because I think that agreement to the request of the Senator from Georgia would clearly give the budget bill a chance where it will otherwise have none.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Georgia is filibustering against the budget bill right at this moment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia does not realize the fix that he is in by being kind and polite in trying to get consideration of the joint resolution? I wish to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that probably when he has been here a little longer he will discover that the only way he can get anything here is by fighting for it. We have the spectacle of two or three Senators who are going to block absolutely the Senator from Georgia in getting action on his joint resolution. It is the situation in the Senate and he might as well understand it. I will join the Senator from Georgia when we get back here in December in seeing if we can not have a fight that will enable measures to be passed and not be vetoed by two or three Senators.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has suggested one way, and that is to fight for it. There is still another way, and that is to wait until just about the time when we have agreed to adjourn and then threaten that you will prevent an adjournment unless you can get your bills considered in preference to all others.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what the Senator from Iowa is doing.

Mr. KENYON. That comes with poor grace from the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The suggestion just made by the Senator from North Dakota probably has some meat in it, and it is probably well for the Senator from Georgia to follow his advice. As I understand it, that is about what he is doing. It is a good deal like a strike. The men sometimes must resort to a desperate remedy to get any recognition or to get any rights.

If the Senator from Georgia will proceed, even though he may go down to defeat and some one else may go down with him, and pursue that course once or twice, other Senators will not try to put across the Senate and through the Senate a resolution of adjournment which, under the practice of the Senate, when it once passes, practically gives anyone the power to block any proceedings that he sees fit to block. If the Senator from Georgia must give up in order that something else may be put through, knowing that that means the death of something else on which he ought to have had a right to be heard and have the Senate pass its judgment upon it, it seems to me he is justified. It is perhaps the only remedy left, to resort to the same method.

I think that now, and I thought it when we considered the resolution to adjourn. As I said at the time, it meant that deliberation and consideration by the Senate from that time on, the time being so short, was practically impossible.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I was not quite through, Mr. President, if the Chair will indulge me and if the Senator from Georgia will indulge me a little longer.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield further to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no disposition to criticize the Finance Committee. I have not criticized them, although it has been said here that those who favor the joint resolution have not been fair to the Finance Committee. It has been said here that it is impossible to get a quorum. I have no doubt of the truth of that, that we could not get a quorum.

That very fact, it seems to me, particularly when the joint resolution has been slumbering before that committee for months and months, is a sufficient reason why we ought to discharge the committee and take up the joint resolution. No one intends any reflection upon any committee. It comes with poor grace from the Finance Committee, after having had this resolution so long and particularly after we had the understanding that took place at the time the Senator from Georgia has mentioned when pressing this resolution before—it comes with poor grace now, it seems to me, for the Finance Committee to complain. The Finance Committee could have met it all today by making a report. It might have been an adverse report, if they felt such a report should be made, but they took all the evidence they did take and still took no action, but wanted the resolution to lie on slumbering in the pigeonholes of that committee forever.

So far as I am concerned I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for the course he has taken. The only objection I have heard is that it was not taken soon enough. It ought to have been taken sooner, and although something else that is good may go down, the only way I think that we can get fair recognition is to let it go down.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I voted against the final adjournment resolution. I thought it would have been very much better not to have named a day for adjournment. I think it would have been very much better to have recessed. The Senator from Georgia knows that I voted against the adjournment resolution.

But now let us see the situation as it exists to-day. Here is a joint resolution, not a Senate resolution. It can not possibly go to the House; it can not be acted upon at all at this time. There is before the Senate the budget bill, a piece of legislation that has been called for by the people of the United States for the last eight years, at least. I say that the budget bill is not perfect. I know that it will have to be amended in many respects in the future. But I also know that it is a step in the right direction. I know we are going to get information if the budget bill becomes a law which it is impossible to secure under existing conditions.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Georgia permit me to ask the Senator from Utah a question?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, with reference to the budget bill, whether he is familiar with the President's veto message and his contention as to the changes that should be made and that have been made in the bill? Does the Senator think the President is right in his contention?

Mr. SMOOT. There is a question as to whether he is right or whether he is not. I have not studied the matter closely enough and examined the Constitution of the United States sufficiently to express an opinion whether, from the legal standpoint, the veto is right or wrong. But I do know that if the budget bill is not passed by the Senate within a very few moments it will be useless to undertake to pass it at this session of Congress.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. Again, if the joint resolution were passed, it would not advance action on it at all. It can not go to the House and be acted upon. So why not use every effort of the Senate now to secure the passage of the budget bill in order that it may go to the House and be accepted, and then go to the President and be signed?

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah why not pass them both? If the Senator from Utah had acceded to the request of the Senator from Georgia, we probably would have had them both passed by now.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator why, and I will tell him why I made the request. I understand that there are two Senators who are not going to allow the budget bill to be considered. If there has to be a filibuster, let us filibuster upon

it rather than upon anything else. It will not hasten legislation a single particle now to lay it aside and take up the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. If that be true, the Senator's request asks an impossibility. If the Senator knows there are some other Senators who are going to object to the consideration of the budget bill, how does he expect to get anywhere with the request he has made? He knows he can not get the budget bill considered.

Mr. SMOOT. I want them to object if they are going to do so, and then we will know where we are.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator had acceded to the other course and we had had a vote on the joint resolution of the Senator from Georgia, we would have reached that very point and then whoever is going to object to the consideration of the budget bill would have to come out in the open and object.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether we would or not. That I can not tell, nor can the Senator, either, but I do know that the President of the United States in his veto message said he is deeply interested in the budget legislation, and the only reason why he vetoed it was because he thought powers vested in him had been taken from him, powers that under the Constitution belong to the Executive. Now, the House has prepared an entirely new bill to meet the objection which the President had to it, and the President's veto message expresses the hope that that legislation will pass in its amended form.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRIS. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has referred to the lack of courtesy shown the Senator from Georgia by the Senator from Utah. I will go a little beyond that. I had what I thought was an understanding with the Senator from Utah in the committee meeting the other day that a resolution which suited me would be brought out. I left for my home with that understanding. Not only have I not been treated with courtesy but bad faith has been shown, if that is parliamentary, Mr. President. I should like to say more than that if it were parliamentary. The Senator from Utah knows that he has gone beyond what a Senator should do in this body in preventing this resolution from coming up. I introduced a Senate resolution more than six months ago and the Senator from Utah objected to it. I was not familiar with the rules, and the Senator from Utah did not tell me every time he objected that under a new law the resolution would have to be a joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Not under a new law.

Mr. HARRIS. Under a law enacted since the passage of a similar resolution two years ago under which the Senate was furnished information regarding income-tax returns. The records of the Senate will show what the Senator from Utah said about it.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has taken less of the time of the Senate than has any other Senator in this body. There is not one Senator but has occupied tenfold more of the time of the Senate during the past year than I have occupied.

The Senator from Georgia has been courteous to the Senator from Utah; he has never objected to a request for unanimous consent when he has asked it; he has never asked for a quorum call or done anything else to delay the business of the Senate. The Senator from Georgia, however, has just started in fighting in this matter.

I know there are Senators here who are not only in sympathy with profiteers, but who do not want the people of this country to know the profits made by those men. Many of those men ought to be in jail, and yet Senators on this floor are by their methods and efforts keeping the people of this country from knowing what the profiteers have done.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina, who first asked me to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to make a suggestion. I am heartily in sympathy with the complaint of the Senator from Georgia. I do not mean to say that I indorse his reflections, if any, upon the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], but I indorse his complaint about not getting action upon his resolution. I want to see a vote on that resolution at this session, because I think the Senator from Georgia has been promised a vote and that he has relied upon that promise. The Senator from Georgia relying upon that promise, I want him to have a vote. But I am anxious also, Mr. President, that there shall be an opportunity now given, although it may result in no accomplishment, for

the Senate to act upon the budget bill in time for it to be signed and become a law.

Now, I want to suggest to the Senator from Georgia—and I think he ought to adopt this suggestion—that he permit the proposition which he has made to be turned around and presented in this form: That immediately following action upon the budget bill unanimous consent be given that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution and that a vote be taken upon it without further debate. I believe if that is done, the Senator will probably get an opportunity for a vote upon his resolution.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. NUGENT. I desire to ask the Senator from North Carolina what his proposition would avail. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a few moments ago made a statement to the effect that there are Senators in this Chamber who propose to speak in opposition to the budget bill. The inference, as a matter of course, is plain that it is the intention to filibuster against the budget bill until such time as the hour for adjournment arrives. In that event, as a matter of course, it will be impossible for a vote to be taken upon the resolution of the Senator from Georgia. Why can not a vote be had upon the resolution of the Senator from Georgia now?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am very anxious to have a vote upon it.

Mr. NUGENT. And when that matter is disposed of, then, as a matter of course, the budget bill may be brought before the Senate.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am very heartily in favor of the budget bill; I voted for it; I shall vote for it again if the opportunity presents itself; but I am also interested in the other measure. I should dislike very much to see either of these measures fail, but if there is a possible chance of securing the passage of one of them—and I believe there is—if we are permitted to take a vote on the resolution of the Senator from Georgia, there is no reason why that should go down with the wreck or that we should sacrifice the joint resolution and permit the budget bill to again come before the Senate, with no action to be taken upon it ultimately.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not recall the statement of the Senator from Utah, but I hardly think the statement to the effect that there would be an organized filibuster against the budget bill is correct. I knew that objection would be made, probably, to an immediate vote.

Mr. SMOOT. I never said there was an organized filibuster.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not believe that to be the situation in the Senate. I knew that objection might be made to an immediate vote, but I did not know of any purpose on the part of any Senator to filibuster to the ultimate defeat of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I desire to read from the Record of last night. I read from the official report:

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to say to the Senator from Georgia now that even though a unanimous-consent agreement were not made here to-night he is entitled to a vote; and I am perfectly willing to have an understanding, if such a thing can be done, that the discussion shall not take more than an hour, and then that we shall vote upon the joint resolution.

The Senator from Utah further said:

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think any Senator is going to get up here and take the whole time. It would disgust every other Senator if he did.

After some further debate, Mr. President, I interjected—and that is the reason I allowed the resolution to go over—

Mr. HARRIS. And a vote taken on the resolution itself not later than 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is already contained in the request. Is there any objection to the request for unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and the Senate consents.

Now, if the Senator from Utah wants to continue to object and show to the Senate the way he has acted about this matter, he has a right as a Senator to do so, but I did not believe that there was a Senator on this floor who would take an unfair advantage of another Senator in such a manner as he is doing or trying to do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senator to yield; I want the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. I had yielded to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not now asking for the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to secure the floor as soon as I can, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRIS. I renew my—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, in my anxiety to pass this bill I want to avail myself of every possible chance, and I will ask the Senator from Utah if he will not meet the Senator from Georgia half way by putting the request in this form: That after half past 3 o'clock, if action has not been taken on the budget bill, he will ask that it be laid aside in order to give the Senator from Georgia an opportunity to take up his joint resolution under a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from North Carolina that he must couple with that the stipulation that there must be a vote on the resolution of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I understood the request would include, namely, unanimous consent to take the resolution up and to vote immediately without further debate.

Mr. NORRIS. If the provision "without further debate" is included, I have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to make a statement.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not desire to ask a question.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish to make a statement.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia, in the first place, complains bitterly of the committee on account of not taking action on the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me interrupt the Senator. I have not complained of the committee; I complain of the Senator from Utah acting in bad faith toward me about getting the joint resolution before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I will confine my statement to the Senator from Utah. Before the Senator from Georgia returned to his home this question arose in the Senate. At that time I stated upon the floor of the Senate that a meeting of the Finance Committee would be called for the following day, which was the 24th day of May. The committee was called together. There was no member of the committee who had any idea that the investigation proposed by the joint resolution would cost \$600,000. I was not the member of the committee who complained about it. The Senator from Georgia was asked to be present at that meeting, and he heard the statements made by the representatives of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Georgia thought the Senator from Utah had agreed with him to bring out this resolution in a form that was satisfactory to both of them, and the Senator from Georgia left for his home with that understanding.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the story just as it happened, and I think the Senator from Georgia will say that I am exactly accurate. After the Finance Committee learned that the report could not be finished within some six to nine months, would cost \$600,000, and not only that but would disrupt the whole organization of the Treasury Department—and that is what was stated to the committee—they thought that perhaps they ought to procure a written statement from the officials of the Treasury Department as to the facts in the case. That request was made, and the letter which has been read to the Senate was written the following day, May 25.

The Senator from Georgia knows that after the committee adjourned I called his attention to the fact, after he told me that he had to return home, that if a report on the joint resolution was to be made from the committee it ought to be along the same lines as the resolution, in response to which a report was submitted and embodied in Public Document No. 259.

Mr. HARRIS. And the Senator from Georgia agreed to the statement of the Senator from Utah and left Washington with the understanding that the Senator from Utah would prepare a resolution in the committee and bring it to the Senate in the absence of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, no such thing as that was suggested by the Senator from Georgia. I expected the committee would act upon the Senator's resolution which was before the committee, but when the information from the Treasury Department was laid before the committee, the acting chairman of the committee undertook to get the testimony together. I was not opposed and I say now that I am not opposed to the resolution being acted upon.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator has said that for six months but has objected every time I have tried to get it up.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator please let me finish my statement?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that I have to-day asked unanimous consent of the Senate that the resolution be voted upon, but unanimous consent was not granted. In reference to the

statement which I made last night on the floor of the Senate, I still stand in the same position that I then occupied, but the budget bill is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no budget bill before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Was not unanimous consent granted for its consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The bill before the Senate is Senate bill 3944, to create a Federal live-stock commission and to define its powers and duties, and so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the unfinished business at 2 o'clock; that is true.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will yield, although I have the floor, I desire to say that if he will help me get a vote on my resolution I will help him to get a vote on the budget bill, and will be glad to do so. I ask the Senator to agree to that; it will not take eight minutes to vote on my resolution and to add to it a short amendment consisting of two lines which I desire to offer.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I say a word?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I listened very attentively to the reading of the record of last night's proceedings, and I think the Senator from Georgia has made out a good case. I did not so understand it at the time, but I think the unanimous consent then obtained as shown by the Record entitles the Senator to a vote.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I was one who agreed to the request for unanimous consent, and although I did so under a misapprehension, I think, under the circumstances, the Senator is entitled to a vote before we adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator from Colorado clears the situation in this respect. I stood here trying to get action upon the budget bill, but I was told by one Senator that he was not going to allow it to pass, and the Senator from Colorado said that he was going to object to the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true, Mr. President; but since bearing the Record read I certainly would not object under any circumstances.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why I objected. I thought we might just as well keep the budget bill before the Senate as to undertake to put a joint resolution before the Senate and transfer the filibuster. I could not see any good whatever in it. If the Senator from Colorado is not going to object to the consideration of this matter, then I have not any objection at all to taking up the joint resolution and voting on it.

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly can not object, in the face of the action of the Senate last night.

Mr. SMOOT. But I want to say to the Senator from Georgia that his remarks that have been made here, trying to cast reflections upon the Senator from Utah, were uncalled for. The Senator from Utah knew what he was doing when he made the statement that he did, and the Senator from Georgia knows that upon this floor to-day I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of his joint resolution, and he is trying to make it appear that I am objecting to it.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, Mr. President, as there seems to be a misunderstanding, and the Record speaks for itself, I will ask unanimous consent for a vote on Senate joint resolution 146 without further debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think there is any misunderstanding as to the Record.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think so.

Mr. THOMAS. The misunderstanding was as to my recollection of what occurred, and I stand corrected by the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to laying aside the unfinished business for the purpose of considering the joint resolution of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRIS. For the purpose of voting upon it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, if it is laid aside temporarily, there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to temporarily laying it aside for the purpose of considering the joint resolution of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and the Chair lays the joint resolution before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918, and it was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate the following information to be secured from the income and profits tax returns for the taxable year 1918 of all corporations:

Capital stock; invested capital; net income; tax (1) income, (2) excess profits, (3) total; per cent of total tax to net income; net income, after deducting tax; per cent of net income to capital stock; per cent of net income to invested capital; per cent of net income, after deducting tax, to capital stock; per cent of net income, after deducting tax, to invested capital; capital stock, 1917; net income, 1917; per cent of net income to capital stock, 1917; excess of the per cent of net income to capital stock for 1918 above the percentage for 1917.

That the information be transmitted in form similar to that obtaining in Senate Document No. 259, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, which contains the information transmitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in response to the resolution of the Senate of June 6, 1918, and that the corporations be listed in the same sequence and under the same symbols, as far as possible, as obtain in Senate Document No. 259.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in line 6, page 1, after the word "corporations," I move to insert the words "which have earned in excess of 25 per cent on their capital stock."

I ask for a rising vote on that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, after the word "corporations," at the end of the line, it is proposed to insert: Which have earned in excess of 25 per cent on their capital stock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 2, line 2, after the word "excess," there ought to be an amendment by inserting the words "or decrease." There may be companies that had 25 per cent profit in 1916 that have not had any increase since then; it may be a decrease.

Mr. HARRIS. I will agree to that. I accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator from Georgia accepts it.

Mr. SMOOT. Wait just a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator a question? Why not have 1919 in as well as 1918?

Mr. HARRIS. The 1919 reports are not all completed, and I did not wish to delay the matter. We can ask for that at the next session.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator know when they will be completed?

Mr. HARRIS. It will be several months.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I will not offer the amendment. I should like to have the information for 1919 in addition to 1918. I think it would be of more value—

Mr. HARRIS. The information called for in the joint resolution will be so interesting that there will be no trouble in getting it next year.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me suggest an amendment, to add the words "and 1919 when said reports are completed."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Missouri will not ask for that.

Mr. REED. Very well; I will not.

Mr. SMOOT. That would only cost \$600,000, and we do not care anything about that now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. There is another amendment which should be made in order to make it read right. On page 2, line 3, after the word "above," I move to insert the words "or below."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "above," on line 3, page 2, it is proposed to insert the words "or below."

Mr. HARRIS. I accept that amendment, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply desire to say, in this connection, that I want the Senate to understand that they are taking the responsibility, if this resolution becomes a law, of disrupting the working force of the Treasury Department. The department has pleaded that this joint resolution be not passed.

I will simply content myself by making that statement.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on the calendar day of June 3, which was the legislative day of June 2, I offered Senate resolution 383; and on yesterday the Senate, on my motion, referred the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with instructions to make a report on the convening of the Senate on this calendar day, June 5. I desire to ask the Chair whether that report has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no report.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the chairman of the committee, is in the Chamber. May I ask him why the report has not been made?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate had no opportunity to make the report. The Senate has been engaged in other business.

I now report the resolution. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to report Senate resolution 383 adversely.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask whether that is the report of the entire committee or simply a majority report?

Mr. CALDER. A majority report.

Mr. POMERENE. Who were the Senators who supported it?

Mr. CALDER. The chairman of the committee and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. POMERENE. What other members of the committee were present?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I ask that the report as presented be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] reports adversely, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate resolution 383, which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That the powers conferred upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections and the subcommittee heretofore appointed by it under Senate resolution 357 be, and they are hereby, extended so as to authorize and require the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or the subcommittee thereof now acting under Senate resolution 357, to investigate, after the adjournment of the Democratic national convention, and before the November elections, 1920, the receipts and expenditures of the several political committees, and the receipts and expenditures of the campaigns conducted by, and on behalf of, or against, the election of the several candidates for President and Vice President, and the United States Senate, and for said purposes the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or the said subcommittee, and the members thereof, are hereby clothed with the same powers conferred on said committee and said subcommittee, and the members thereof, by said resolution No. 357; and they are further directed to make report of their proceedings to the Senate not later than the first Monday in December, 1920.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], a member of this committee, to present the minority report, which I send to the desk and ask to have read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if we are going to act upon this matter at all, I think we ought to have a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have not yielded for that purpose. I have not yielded at all. I ask that the report be read.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment to ask if the supply bills have been messaged back to the Senate yet?

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that they have been.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Can a point of no quorum be raised while a Senator is occupying the floor without his consent?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. KENYON. There are two conversations going on here at the same time.

Mr. ROBINSON. A point of order. The Senator from Ohio, having the floor to address the Senate, declined to yield to the Senator from Utah for the purpose of making a point of no quorum. Under the rule of the Senate the point can not be made unless the Senator having the floor yields for that purpose. Manifestly the Senator from Ohio not having yielded, the point could not be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Senator from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I now ask that the minority report be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the report.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible during the address of a Senator for another Senator to rise and not be recognized by the Chair and make a point of no quorum? It appears to be the usual practice of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio had the floor, for what purpose the Chair does not know; but in look-

ing at the precedents the Chair finds that the precedents say that a Senator can not be interrupted without his consent to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then what the Chair meant to say was that the point of order was sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Chair said it was overruled. That made the confusion. I thought I understood what the Chair meant.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. I am not yielding to the Senator. I have asked that the report be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Assistant Secretary read the views of the minority submitted by Mr. McKellar, as follows:

"Mr. McKellar, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, submitted the following minority report, to accompany S. Res. 333:

"For the minority I dissent from the report of the majority. If ever a Senate investigation has been fruitful of good results, this investigation has been fruitful. Already it has been ascertained that millions of dollars in the aggregate have been used by various candidates for nomination for the Presidency. The use of these funds in the way they have been used is commonly called a national scandal. If men will spend several millions for a nomination for the Presidency, how much will be spent in the actual election? Where is this thing going to stop? Are we going to permit the Presidency to be put up for sale and bought by the candidate having the most money? I do not believe anyone will say we ought to do that. Then we ought to continue this investigation. If we stop this now it will be equivalent to saying that the Senate is perfectly willing to establish the truth about the campaign expenses of certain of the contestants for the nomination, but it is not willing to turn the light of day upon the campaign expenses of the successful candidates after they are nominated. Suppose one of these candidates who has used a half million or a million or more secures a nomination; the defeat of this resolution would be equivalent to saying to him, 'Well, you have bought your nomination, now go ahead and buy your election. The Senate will not molest you.' Neither a nomination nor an election to the Presidency should be put up and sold to the highest bidder. We have a splendid opportunity now to put an end to the important use of money in these elections and in nominating primaries. This committee has done a splendid work and is entitled to the thanks of all patriotic and honest Americans. Let us give them authority to finish its good work. For the minority I recommend that the resolution do pass.

"KENNETH MCKELLAR."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this resolution grew largely out of the results of hearings which we have been holding during the past several weeks. There has been one recess after another, and I have been admonished that this resolution shall not pass because an objection could and would be made to its consideration under the rules of the Senate.

I recognize that it is within the power of the majority under the rules to prevent the final passage of this resolution. When I presented the resolution and asked for its consideration, the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. Lodge] asked that it go over for a day. By reason of that fact I concluded that perhaps I could progress somewhat more rapidly if I were to ask to have the resolution referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and the Senate on my motion, which was passed without a dissenting voice, referred the resolution to that committee with instructions to report it back on the convening of the Senate on this calendar day June 5.

One matter after another has occupied the floor, and the distinguished chairman of that committee did not make the report until about 2.30 this afternoon, within an hour and a half prior to the time of the adjournment.

I am not deceived by these methods of procedure. I recognize that the Republican majority are determined there shall be no further investigation if it is possible to prevent it.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] offered the original resolution under which we have been operating for two weeks, authorizing the investigation of the preconvention receipts and expenditures of the several presidential candidates. It would not have passed except for his persistence and his insistence, and now I know that if I am to yield the floor a point of order will be made against it; but I want to ask those of you who may make the point of order, will you say it is made with the approval of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who is a candidate for the Republican nomination for President?

Will you make the point of order with the approval of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], my distinguished colleague, who is a candidate for the nomination for President?

Will you make the point of order with the approval of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is a candidate for the nomination?

Will you make the point of order with the approval of Mr. Lowden, the governor of Illinois, who is a candidate for the nomination on your ticket?

Will you make it with the approval of Gen. Leonard Wood, who is likewise a candidate?

Or with the consent of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], who is a candidate for the nomination for President?

Will you make the point of order with the approval of my genial and able friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], whose name as a candidate is being considered by many admiring friends and associates?

The governor of Massachusetts is urged by his friends. Will you make the point of order with his approval?

The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] is a candidate likewise. Will you make the point of order with his approval?

Then, we have in this Chamber the great and learned Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is chosen, I understand, as the temporary chairman of the Republican convention. Will you make the point of order with his approval?

Senators, let me admonish you, you dare not strain at the gnat of parliamentary law and swallow the camel of corrupt or excessive use of money in the politics in this country. That day is past, and without having any direct authority from those who have offered themselves as Democratic candidates, I submit that no one will rise in the Senate, or through the public prints, and object to this investigation on their behalf.

Aye, more, there has been going throughout the length and breadth of this land for more than two years that eminent politician, Mr. Hays, the chairman of the Republican national committee. Will he object to this investigation? Somebody says "Deacon" Hays. I do not know whether that is his first name or not. But I want to submit to you that the chairman of the Democratic committee will not object, and I assert that no Democratic Senator here will object to this investigation.

Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senators this further thought: When the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] offered his resolution and called the attention of the Senate to some of the alleged practices in behalf of certain candidates he had information which justified him in the course he pursued, but he had no better evidence that money was being extravagantly used in support of the several candidates for the nomination for President than we have now that money has been extravagantly used by at least one of the national committees.

I want to be perfectly fair and frank about this. Shortly after the war had concluded it was charged through the press that certain very rich men, presuming to act in the interest of the Democratic Party, had gotten together on a plan whereby they expected to raise a slush fund of from five to ten million dollars. I do not believe that is so, but I do not know; and on behalf of the Democratic Party, to which I owe allegiance, I insist that there shall be an examination whereby we can either prove or disprove those charges. That is my position. The United States Senate can not play favorites either with men or with parties.

On the other hand, the distinguished chairman of the Republican national committee, Mr. Hays, had scarcely warmed his seat before the papers were filled with information—it may be only alleged information—to the effect that the largest slush fund ever in the history of the politics of the United States was to be raised, and stories were printed in the papers to the effect that he was going into each particular State, and that he was summoning the leaders, the captains, the generals, of his party together for the purpose of taking counsel, and the word went out that he wanted the Republicans in each State to raise a given sum, and he, as the chairman of the committee, would duplicate it. Out in the State of Ohio the report was current that \$600,000 was to be raised.

I can not vouch for these stories. I do not know. If I am a member of this committee, I shall try to find out about them. I am not enamored of the undertaking, but I will not shirk it, and I will not play any favorites with any man or any party, if I am on the committee.

Can you Republicans, who seem to think that the god of fortune favors you this fall, say to the American people, "It is none of your business where or from whom we get our funds, or how we shall spend them"? Can my colleagues on this side

of the Chamber say it is none of the American people's business how much money we get, or from what sources, or what we do with it?

No; we on this side of the Chamber will not say it, and you on the other side of the aisle dare not say it.

Now, Mr. President, let me call your attention very briefly to a few of the disclosures made before the committee having charge of this investigation. I am very happy to say that as to most of the candidates who were investigated there was no evidence that the funds raised were exorbitant in amount or that any of them were illegally used. As an American citizen I blush because I am compelled to say that as to at least two of the candidates seeking the Presidency extravagant sums of money have been used.

Dr. Hershey, representing the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], testified about two weeks ago that they had raised by contribution \$473—

Mr. REED. Four hundred and seventy-three thousand?

Mr. POMERENE. No; \$473, and that debts were incurred amounting to \$3,700.

Mr. E. H. Moore, who is the representative of the distinguished governor of my State, came before us and said that the funds raised in behalf of Gov. Cox's candidacy amounted to \$19,600.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] came before our committee and advised us that the Hitchcock campaign committee had raised \$3,300, and that he himself had probably expended \$500 of his own money in traveling.

The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] was represented before the committee by Mr. Beller, his manager, and he testified that they had raised \$13,105.50.

Former Congressman Carlin appeared on behalf of the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer, who is a candidate for the nomination for President, and from him it developed the sum raised—and I believe they had a slight surplus on hand—was \$59,185.76.

Mr. Harry M. Daugherty, representing the candidacy of my distinguished colleague [Mr. HARDING], appeared before the committee and testified that their total receipts were \$113,109.50.

Mr. James B. Reynolds, representing the distinguished governor of Massachusetts, Mr. Coolidge, said that they had raised in his behalf \$68,375.

Two men came in, not to speak of others, but two men who claimed to speak authoritatively appeared before our committee representing the candidacy of Mr. Herbert Hoover. The California headquarters raised \$101,725.10. The eastern headquarters in New York raised \$66,332.87, making a total of \$168,057.97.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was represented by his two managers. Mr. MacSweeney raised in his eastern headquarters \$72,230.54, and Mr. John Henry Rosseter, representing his western or California headquarters, raised \$125,000, making a total of \$197,230.54.

I might say that I have not had the time to check up the records entirely, and there may be a few insignificantly small amounts which should be added to some of these totals, but they will not vary substantially from the figures which I have given.

And now I come to the candidacy of Mr. Lowden, the governor of the State of Illinois. There was raised by contribution in his behalf \$35,000, and he contributed out of his own funds \$379,159.78.

Mr. REED. His wife.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; by him and his wife. This makes a total of \$414,159.78 up to about 10 days ago. Think of it! The salary of the President of the United States for four years amounts to only \$300,000, and yet one family, pro bono publico, is willing to raise nearly \$400,000 to get a \$300,000 job.

Mr. REED. To get the nomination for it.

Mr. POMERENE. I stand corrected and I thank the Senator—to get the nomination.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I read from the testimony of Mr. Lowden's manager when he was dealing with expenses:

Gov. Lowden was opposed to newspaper publicity and we have not entered into it.

So this money was not expended to convince the public.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, Mr. President, I think I can fairly state that this examination has not yet been completed.

But then there is another candidate, Leonard Wood—Gen. Leonard Wood, friend of Theodore Roosevelt. We were advised by witnesses who came before us that it was necessary to expend a large sum of money in order to let the American voters know the virtues of Gen. Leonard Wood. I am not denying his great ability, but with all his great abilities he has one failing.

No one, not even his most active friends, would accuse Gen. Leonard Wood of having the ability to hide his light under a bushel, and yet how much was raised by Gen. Leonard Wood?

Before I go to that, let me suggest that it was amply proven before the committee that there was a gathering of his friends, a gathering of the faithful, at which time they preliminarily agreed to underwrite his campaign to the extent of \$500,000.

Mr. REED. A starter?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; a starter. Then he had his good angel from my State, Col. Procter—Col. William Cooper Procter, he of Ivory soap fame, a man who is engaged in the laudable enterprise of electing a President of the United States.

Mr. REED. Keeping the people clean.

Mr. POMERENE. And, as the Senator from Missouri suggests, he wanted to keep the people clean. But, my friends, it will take a more powerful disinfectant than Ivory soap to keep clean the political morals of the United States if we allow these extravagant expenditures in behalf of favored candidates. Bear in mind, we have just got started in this matter. Why, we do not know anything about the convention expenditures yet, and if it takes all the money that he expended in the preliminary campaign prior to the convention, will some one tell me how much it will likely cost to secure the election?

Mr. REED. The nomination.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes, or the nomination; either one.

But let us see! Col. William Cooper Procter, for Gen. Wood, said he was engaged in this work as a work of idealism, just as idealistic, he claimed, as if he were working in the interest of the Red Cross—

Mr. REED. Or the Anti-Saloon League.

Mr. POMERENE. I want you to know a little more about my friend, Col. William Cooper Procter. At the Wood national headquarters in Chicago, up to the date of the appearance of the treasurer, Mr. Sprague, they had raised \$1,180,043.20. Now, Mr. President, this was raised in part by subscriptions. I do not know that I can place my finger upon the exact amount, but it was in the neighborhood of \$300,000—between \$200,000 and \$300,000. Then the good angel, Mr. Procter himself, advanced \$521,000 as a loan. When I put the question to him, "Do you expect to get it back?" his answer was, "Why, Mr. Pomereene, I think you are expressing that a little bit too strong."

But in addition to the \$521,000 which he himself loaned, he went to the bank and borrowed another \$100,000, making \$621,000. Then he, with Mr. Sprague, gave their joint note for another \$100,000, making \$721,000. Then they had another very good friend from New York, who likewise went to the bank and raised another \$100,000.

There was raised in New York—let us not misunderstand this—something over \$400,000. Part of that was accounted for at the Wood headquarters in Chicago. There was, however, a balance of \$228,359.01 raised by the New York headquarters, which was in addition to \$1,180,043.20 accounted for by the Chicago headquarters. There were also local organizations all over the country. We do not know what amount of money was raised by them. We do know, however, that in the State of Michigan there was raised and expended over \$70,000, they having arranged to take care of the campaign themselves; and Mr. Alger, a very rich man, a son of former Senator Alger, himself raised something like \$70,000, if I remember the figures aright.

Then in my own State—and we have had only one witness who knew anything about the situation there, so far as funds raised within the State are concerned—Mr. Robert F. Wolfe, of Columbus, a prominent manufacturer, a man who is straightforward in his statements, said that he subscribed \$1,500 to the Franklin County campaign committee, and that he himself had expended personally over \$12,800. The newspapers are my authority for the statement that Mr. Dan Hanna raised \$6,000, to be expended in Cleveland. There was a very active campaign in that State, as there was in other States. I do not know what the amount is that was expended in addition to that for which we have the figures; I can not tell you that; but now, when we are trying to ascertain the methods that have been resorted to in the interest of the several candidates before the convention and have other reports to the effect that men in the interest of the Democratic Party were trying to raise a slush fund of from five to ten million dollars, and those interested in behalf of the Republican campaign were raising mints of money, is anybody going to object to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. What is the Wood campaign total?

Mr. POMERENE. The total of the Wood campaign will amount, as we have the figures now, to little less than \$1,500,000, and the returns are not all in. Just a word more and I shall have concluded.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield for a question.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to know if the Senator's resolution would cover the investigation of large contributions in connection with appointive positions such as ambassadors and officers of that kind?

Mr. POMERENE. My resolution does not name ambassadors. It goes to the extent of examining into the question of the receipts and expenditures of campaign committees and of candidates. I think it is comprehensive enough, because it provides for the investigation of persons, as I now recall the language, and others who may be interested and may have taken an active part in the campaign.

Mr. KENYON. I think it should go to the extent of covering the cases I have suggested. The Senator from Ohio is undoubtedly familiar with the facts incident to the Wilson campaign fund and the ambassadorships that seemed to follow the payment of large contributions, which is just as objectionable as anything else.

Mr. POMERENE. I happened to have been a member of the committee in 1912 that went into these subjects, and I can assure the Senator from Iowa that so long as those investigations continued there was not any favoritism shown. We are going into an investigation of the present campaign, and if the Senator desires to go into the other matter I have no objection at all to doing so. If he has reference to investigation as to ambassadors who may be appointed under the successful ticket at the November election, I shall interpose no objection to it.

Mr. KENYON. I know the Senator from Ohio is fair about it, and I do not think that he means to imply that there has been any unfairness about the present investigation.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not; not at all.

Mr. KENYON. I have here a list of various campaign contributions; for instance, that of Mr. Gerard—

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator yield to me for just a few moments? I have the floor, I understand.

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. I wish to finish my remarks in just a few minutes. I shall have no objection to the Senator inserting in the Record any figures which he may see fit after I shall have concluded.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio a question or two with regard to his resolution?

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator only desires to ask a question, I yield; but I desire to conclude within a very few minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. I am anxious to get action on the resolution. Is not the Senator going to try to have his resolution passed?

Mr. POMERENE. Indeed, I am going to make that effort, and I will conclude in about two minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he ought to amend the resolution and extend the time. The time is limited to the 1st of December.

Mr. POMERENE. I shall have no objection to that, if the Senator feels that that is necessary.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will remember the suggestion just made, for instance, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON].

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not misunderstand the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. I know the Senator does not.

Mr. NORRIS. And I hope the Senator does not misunderstand me.

Mr. POMERENE. I was simply going to say, if the Senator please, that the resolution can not be made too broad to suit me.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the reason I wanted to extend it.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well. In just a moment or two I will conclude.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to continue, I do not care what a man's politics may be, he can not fail to be impressed with the fact that there have been very extravagant expenditures of money in political campaigns past and present. Conditions are such as almost to remind one of Belshazzar's feast; but let me remind those Senators who favor these large expenditures, or who are going to participate in them, that long years ago when Belshazzar gave his great feast he saw the handwriting on the wall. So during the coming campaign there will be another handwriting on the wall for the party or parties which indulge in this kind of extravagant expenditure. It will be the handwriting of the American people. Liberally translated it will read, "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting."

In closing, I desire to say that I am sorry the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is not here, because I wanted

to make a suggestion to him. He is going to make a great speech in Chicago, for he never makes a speech that is not a great speech. He is one of the leading scholars and statesmen of the age, and no man knows better how to use the English language than he. If he will not consider me presumptuous, I want to suggest to him, when he approaches his peroration and sums up the great achievements of the Republican Party, that he tell the country how he and his colleagues, constituting the majority party in the Senate, succeeded in preventing the American people from knowing how much money the Republicans were going to expend and from what sources they secured it. I think that such an announcement would captivate the convention; I am sure that it would thrill the American people. After he shall have done that and by parliamentary tactics succeeded in keeping from the public gaze their tremendous receipts and expenditures, and shall have succeeded in carrying the election, I am sure his fame as a great scholar and a successful statesman will be greater even than we, his colleagues, have ever dreamed of in our philosophy.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

#### COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF LAWS.

During the delivery of Mr. POMERENE's speech,

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KNOX. Will the Senator from Ohio be good enough to yield in order that I may make a request for unanimous consent for the consideration and passage of a resolution proposing an amendment to the rules of the Senate and creating a committee on the revision of laws to cooperate with a like committee of the House of Representatives? I do not think there is any objection to it. It was reported by the Committee on Rules this morning.

Mr. POMERENE. I understand that it is a formal matter which will lead to no discussion?

Mr. KNOX. If it leads to any discussion at all, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. POMERENE. With the understanding that I do not yield the floor, I am very happy to grant the Senator's request.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to know if that can be done without temporarily laying aside the unfinished business?

Mr. KNOX. Of course, I only ask to have it done by unanimous consent. I do not think, if my request be granted by unanimous consent, that it will interfere with the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to rule that all this is being done by unanimous consent, and that the consideration of the so-called live-stock commission bill is going to be the last thing that occurs at this session of Congress, except to say good-by.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio said that he did not want to yield the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not want to yield the floor now.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that I will not do anything to take him off the floor, though, so far as that is concerned, he could be taken off the floor; but I want to say to the Senator that just as long as he wants to talk I desire that he shall do so.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, I understand the very generous disposition of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I am glad that is the case.

Mr. POMERENE. I have observed the Senator's actions for many years.

Mr. SMOOT. So have I observed the actions of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution (S. Res. 387) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"There shall be appointed at once and hereafter at the commencement of each Congress a Committee on Revision of the Laws, to consist of three Senators, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives."

Mr. KNOX. I move that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] be appointed members on the part of the Senate of the joint committee created by the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania is appointed.

## NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the committee, consisting of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the majority, and myself, appointed on the part of the Senate to notify the President that the Congress was about to adjourn and to ask if he had any further communications to lay before the Congress, have discharged that duty. The leader of the majority of the Senate is necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I, therefore, desire to make the report, and to say that the President has advised your committee that he has no further communications to lay before the Congress.

## CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES.

After the conclusion of Mr. POMERENE's speech, Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the resolution, of course, is not before the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Then, Mr. President, I move that it be considered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. I beg pardon. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not yield to the Senator.

Mr. President, the resolution, as I understand, has been reported to the Senate to-day, and under the rules of the Senate it must go over for one day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; if there is objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that Senate resolution 383 be recommitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with instructions to report the resolution back to the Senate immediately, with the recommendation that it pass, and on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course, under Rule XXVI the subject matter has gone over for one day. Paragraph 2 of Rule XXVI reads:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Nothing could be plainer, Mr. President, than the language of that rule, and no action can be taken upon the resolution until the day next following the day on which it is reported.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah inform his colleagues whether or not his course has the approval of his associates on the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not asked my colleagues what my course shall be, and I never do. I take whatever course I think is best and proper, not only for the Senate but for the country.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 14102. An act securing rights of way and easements over public land in connection with Federal irrigation projects; and

H. R. 14444. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River connecting Wilbarger County, Tex., and Tillman County, Okla., beginning at a point in the Mrs. Eliza Littleton survey, Wilbarger County, Tex., and extending north to a point near the line between range 21 and range 22 west, township 2 south, Jackson County, Okla.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 11224. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 10, 1918; and

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the compensation of session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives for the month of June, 1920, on the 5th day of said month.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 14102. An act securing rights of way and easements over public land in connection with Federal irrigation projects was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 14444. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River connecting Wilbarger County, Tex., and Tillman County, Okla., beginning at a point in the Mrs. Eliza Littleton survey, Wilbarger County, Tex., and extending north to a point near the line between range 21 and

range 22 west, township 2 south, Jackson County, Okla., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES.

Mr. KENYON and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a point of order that the Chair must consider. Meantime Senators may address the Senate. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, what I have to say will be very brief.

I suppose more or less politics must get into a situation of this character. That is unfortunate. I am sorry the point of order has been made. It does not, I am sure, represent the sentiment of many Members on this side of the Chamber. I trust it will be withdrawn.

Personally I am anxious, and I know there are many others who would be anxious, to have the most thorough investigation made in both parties.

I know that there are legitimate objections that can be urged against that, but they have no weight in my mind. I can not be accused of any partisanship, I am sure, in the way the investigation has been conducted, and I do not feel now, as the chairman of the committee, in discussing it at all from a partisan standpoint or, in fact, entering into any particular discussion about it, but it must not be thought that the fault is all with the Republican Party. I condemn these extreme expenditures as much as any man, and we have conducted this investigation on the theory that we were going to the bottom of this whole thing, no matter who it hit, no matter how hard it hit, and let the chips fall where they would. In studying this record, however, I think it will be found that some of the testimony as to one Democratic candidate is fully as bad as, if not worse than, anything that has been offered as to the Republican candidates; and I am not defending these expenditures on their part by any means. Politics and partisanship ought not to creep into this investigation.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio ought to go, if it could be carried, to the investigation of the question I have suggested—the almost notorious purchase of foreign ambassadorships by large campaign contributions. It is a practice that ought to stop in this country. It debauches the public service and arouses question in the minds of the people of the Nation. I rose to speak of that without any passion or any prejudice and to place in the Record a statement showing some of the large contributors to the Wilson campaign of 1912 and the subsequent positions to which the large contributors were appointed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator read the names?

Mr. KENYON. Some of them. There are too many to read them all.

Mr. Baruch, who has been a very prominent gentleman in this administration, contributed \$12,500. He has been in some kind of governmental positions. I do not know that they have been very lucrative.

I shall refer only to the ambassadors and people of that kind, however.

Mr. W. M. Daniels, of Princeton, N. J., contributed to the campaign \$250 and to the McCombs prenomination fund \$300.

Mr. De Saulles, of New York, minister to Uruguay, contributed \$5,000.

Here is a postmaster who contributes \$214.50.

Mr. Gerard, ambassador to Germany, \$13,500.

Mr. George W. Guthrie, of Pittsburgh, ambassador to Japan, \$1,000.

These contributions, as I understand, were all made before the appointments, of course.

Mr. Thomas D. Jones, of Chicago, who was appointed on the Federal Reserve Board, and declined under fire, \$10,000. He also contributed to the Cleveland E. Dodge prenomination fund \$10,500.

Mr. William Gibbs McAdoo, whose boom for President is invisible, contributed to the McCombs prenomination fund \$2,700, and to another prenomination fund \$400.

Mr. McCombs, of New York, who, according to the press—and I suppose it has not been disputed—was offered the ambassadorship to France, \$11,000.

Mr. Henry Morgenthau, ambassador to Turkey, contributed to one fund \$10,000 and to another \$20,000.

There seem to have been several prenomination funds.

John Barton Payne, chairman of the United States Shipping Board, now Secretary of the Interior, \$15,100.

Frederick C. Penfield, Germantown, Pa., ambassador to Austria-Hungary, \$10,000 to one fund, and to the McCombs prenomination fund \$12,000, being a total of \$22,000.

Mr. Pindell, of Peoria, confirmed ambassador to Russia, and subsequently resigned, \$100. That was rather a small amount for a man who was created ambassador to Russia, but he did not hold the position, I believe, for a long enough time to reach New York.

Mr. Walter W. Vick, Rutherford, N. J., general receiver of customs, Santo Domingo, \$1,750.

Mr. Samuel Untermyer, New York, who has been some kind of special attorney, I have been informed, for the Government, \$17,000.

Mr. Hugh C. Wallace, Tacoma, Wash., ambassador to France, \$10,000.

Joseph E. Willard, Richmond, Va., ambassador to Spain, \$2,000.

Charles R. Crane, of Chicago, offered but declined ambassadorship to Russia, now ambassador to China, \$40,000; and he contributed to the McCombs prenomination fund \$10,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I recall that Mr. Crane was at one time appointed ambassador to Japan or China—China, I think—by the Taft administration. Has the Senator the amount that he contributed to the Taft campaign?

Mr. KENYON. No; I have not, but if the Senator will give it to me, I will gladly put it in my remarks.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If my recollection is correct, the post to China is not an ambassadorship, but our representative there is a minister.

Mr. KENYON. Well, whatever it is, it seems to be worth a \$50,000 campaign contribution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I think the Record shows that Mr. Crane contributed the same amount to the Roosevelt fund the same year that he contributed to Mr. Wilson's fund. I feel sure that that is the fact.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator does not mean that Mr. Roosevelt spent any money in a campaign!

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator knows that, we will accept it as the fact. I do not care to whom they contributed. It is this idea of contributing great sums of money and getting rewards in great ambassadorships; and it is just as bad as the contribution of great sums of money to carry on campaigns.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator, back early in his remarks, mentioned some gentleman who contributed the large sum of, I think, \$150 or \$250. Will the Senator tell what high office that gentleman bought with that large sum? I do not recall that he mentioned what high place he got.

Mr. KENYON. I think it was some minor post office.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to take all the time, because other Senators will follow me.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that the figures which he has just read to the Senate do not include the contributions made by members of families of some of the persons he has already mentioned.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that in going over this list he ought not to overlook Mr. Thomas Nelson Page, a gentleman who wrote pretty little storybooks, and who contributed twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars of his wife's money and got the ambassadorship to Italy and then rented his house in Washington to the Italian Government as an embassy. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENYON. Well, Mr. President, I suppose we can find more fault with the man who contributes his wife's money than with the man who contributes his own money. I have only called attention to this as a part of the general discussion, not at all in criticism of the Senator from Ohio for leaving out that part of it. I know the fairness of the Senator from Ohio, and I know the splendid work he has done on the committee. However, as the pot is calling the kettle black, we might as well have both sides of it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he sits down?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. Has the Senator a record of the contribution made by John W. Davis?

Mr. KENYON. I have not.

Mr. PHELAN. Has the Senator a record of the contribution made by Brand Whitlock?

Mr. KENYON. No; I have not.

Mr. PHELAN. Or by Robert Underwood Johnson?

Mr. KENYON. No. Has the Senator the record of their contributions?

Mr. PHELAN. I was interested because these gentlemen occupy the highest embassies; and if the embassies were put up at auction, as the Senator would intimate, it would be interesting to know that.

Mr. KENYON. I think it would be.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator is aware, is he not, that most of the diplomatic appointments of the first class have gone to members of the Republican Party? It might indicate, if the Senator is aware of that, that there was no traffic in embassies, and that the appointments were made upon merit.

Mr. KENYON. I have given the figures that I have. If the Senator has any more, I shall be glad to add them to the list.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand the able Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has objected to the consideration of this resolution, and that under that objection, if it is sustained, he has carried it over for the day, and therefore for the session.

I wish I might prevail upon the Senator from Utah to withdraw that objection. He is older in the Senate and more experienced in politics than I am; but I venture to say that if that objection is made and sustained, the Senator will agree with me before the ides of November that it was an error of judgment.

There are very few questions before the American people now concerning which they are so deeply aroused and about which they feel so intensely as this question of undertaking to control politics through the sheer use of money. It does not appertain alone to any one political party, and anyone who undertakes to confine it to a mere party movement, or undertakes to present it to the American people from a mere party standpoint, is misrepresenting it and is a partisan before he is a patriot.

The difficulty, Mr. President, in dealing with just these kinds of questions, and the almost impossibility of eliminating them from politics, is that the moment the question is raised the party question enters, and either party will defend the most outrageous things from sheer party expediency. We never can eliminate the use of money in politics if we are going to pursue the course of justifying whatever our party does, regardless of whether it corresponds with decency and conscience or not, and that is the reason, Mr. President, why we can not make headway in regard to these things.

It does not make any difference how many ambassadorships are involved; if it is upon one side of the Chamber, it is defended, and it does not make any difference how much money is expended for a nomination; if it is upon the other side of the Chamber, it is defended or excused. And the most discouraging feature of this whole situation, to my mind, is the fact that after the startling revelations during the last two weeks some of the largest Republican and independent newspapers have undertaken to defend it or excuse it. They are the unworthy purveyors of indecency to the American people, and they ought to be denounced as the advocates of pollution of American citizenship when they do so.

It is not a party question, Mr. President. It is a simple proposition of whether or not there are enough men in this country to stand between those who have made up their minds to control politics through the sheer use of money, and their determination to accomplish their ends in that way, and the American people.

I do not know what my party will do in the next 10 days. I know what the party which was organized under the exalted leadership of Lincoln ought to do, regardless of individuals; and that is, by its course of conduct, when it shall assemble in a few days, to eliminate from consideration any man who undertakes to dominate a great political convention by the sheer use of money. It ought to reject from its consideration men who will accept unconscionable sums of money to be used for personal political advantage. As I have said, this is a matter which is not controlled by candidates or parties, and we should rise to meet the issue. It is a question of protecting the citizenship of this country. If the Republican Party does not clean house between now and next Saturday night, just as surely as patriotism is yet a virtue in this country some way will be found by the people to protect our institutions against these political profiteers.

Men who have gathered their untold millions in this war, men who have profited while young men were sacrificing their lives upon the battle field, men who, looking into the future, thought that they saw disturbances on account of their practices, men who have gathered their wealth and propose at all hazards to defend it, are proposing to control American politics, not by the presentation of great constructive measures which will relieve the conditions in the country, but by the use of the money which they have thus acquired.

Can the party of Lincoln, of Grant, of Sumner; can the party once led by those men who made their flag their first and their only banner, afford to object to the consideration of this resolution in order to send it over, so that this great contest shall not be under supervision or under surveillance until the ides of next November, at a time when the whole country is aroused over this question? I want to see my party win. I want to see it succeed; I believe its principles are more in harmony with the welfare and the happiness of our people and the perpetuity of American institutions.

I want to see it succeed because, if it does succeed, I shall feel more in harmony with its policies than I have felt in harmony with the policies of the opposite party during the last 18 months. I know if the voters' wishes prevail this will be true.

But, Mr. President, I say here, with all the solemnity I can gather, that this party can not succeed by denying to the people knowledge of how it proposes to succeed.

I ask my friend from Utah to reconsider this proposition; let the Republican Party stand upon its record. If there is a contribution coming to the Republican Party, let it be advertised to the world. If it is not advertised, it is a self-evident proposition that it is crooked. If it is not advertised, it is a self-evident proposition that we ought not to receive it. If it is not made public, it is a self-evident proposition that those who are giving it have a sinister motive and a sinister purpose in giving it.

What harm can come if some man wants to contribute money for the success of the party that it be known if it be reasonable and proper? Let the public pass upon it upon the election day. If my friend from Utah excludes the consideration of this resolution, the things which will be charged against us in this campaign will be ten times worse than the things which will be done.

Give us an open field. We should have nothing to conceal. Give us publicity. We should have nothing to hide. Let us, therefore, have this resolution considered, and I beg my friend to withdraw his objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have never in my life used much money in a campaign. I do not know, Mr. President, what the expenditures of unwarranted amounts can accomplish. It has always seemed to me that such an expenditure was a distinct disadvantage or a weakness to the man who does it, and always redounds to his injury.

This resolution, Mr. President, as I understand it, is asking for an investigation of the contributions to campaign funds from now on until election day. In fact, it has been suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that it should be extended. The suggestion is a wise one, if the resolution is to be agreed to. If we had a public press, Mr. President, which did not distort the statements made, but reported them in their true light, there would be no objection to an investigation of campaign contributions. I would not object to a law which would require every donation to a campaign fund to be made public.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. SMOOT. I have only a few moments.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wanted to ask the Senator why he anticipates that the action of the committee will be unfair, when the majority of that committee will be composed of his colleagues on the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not intimated that they would be unfair. I spoke of the unfair reports which were made in the public press. That is all I had reference to, and all I stated. I have not cast any reflection upon the committee in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will please allow me to continue, as I have concluded I shall not object to action being had upon the resolution.

When I made the point of order I felt, Mr. President, that there was not a State in the Union which has not a corrupt-practices act and could deal with the subject matter of the resolution. All are protected in that way, so far as the expenditure of money is concerned, for a national campaign.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I decline to yield, Mr. President.

In that way I thought that we were perfectly justified in not beginning now, during a campaign, the investigation of all sorts of rumors, bringing men from all parts of the country, whether they know anything about the question or not, and keeping the country stirred up during a campaign.

But, Mr. President, I have no objection to making the campaign contributions public, and I have not any objection whatever to this resolution, if it were at any ordinary time. I appreciate what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has said.

As far as I am personally concerned, Mr. President, if there is the least thought in the minds of Senators here that any good can come from such an investigation in any way I shall not make a point of order against it, but will allow it to be voted on now.

Mr. President, I want to say that I consider some of the statements which were made to-day by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] as a reflection upon Senators and not justified. It is perhaps better for me not to say what I had in mind.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator realize that we have to adjourn at 4 o'clock?

Mr. SMOOT. I do; and I know that it is 5 minutes to 4 o'clock. The Senator need not get impatient.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will get impatient.

Mr. SMOOT. It will do the Senator no good.

Mr. KNOX. I hope the Senator from Utah will withdraw his objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly shall, and have so stated, and it shall be acted upon, as far as I am concerned, before 4 o'clock, even if the Senator from Nebraska is so impatient about it; I make that statement so that he need not worry.

Mr. NORRIS. That does help out a great deal.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, I am simply going to close by expressing the hope that if the resolution does pass, there will be some good come from it, and I think, of course, that the committee which will have the investigation in charge will use that judgment which is necessary in order to get the facts, rather than rumors, and present them to the American people, if possible, in their true light, rather than have them garbled and colored, as they generally are, through the public press.

Mr. President, I now withdraw my point of order, and I have no objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has any other Senator any objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### NEWSPRINT INDUSTRY.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from the Committee on Manufactures I submit the report made in pursuance of Senate resolution 164, providing for the investigation of the newsprint industry with a view of discovering whether discriminatory, unjust, or illegal practices are responsible for the present conditions in the newsprint-paper industry and have affected the prices for the products thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be printed.

#### ADDRESS BY HON. R. C. LEFFINGWELL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, several days ago the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] presented an address by the Hon. R. C. Leffingwell, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, as to the Treasury methods of financing the war in relation to inflation. The address was referred to the Committee on Printing for action, and the Senator from Virginia has asked that the committee make a report on the question of printing it as a document. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably the manuscript and ask that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is now before the Senate, being Senate bill 3944.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission, to define its powers and duties, and to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes.

#### FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 4 o'clock upon this, the 5th day of June, in the year of grace 1920, having arrived, in accordance with the authority vested in me by the concurrent

resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, I now declare the Senate of the United States adjourned sine die.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 5 (legislative day of June 2), 1920.*

##### REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Hubbard H. Abbott to be register of the land office at Del Norte, Colo.

John Thomas Joyce to be register of the land office at Durango, Colo.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ALABAMA.

John M. Graham, Stevenson.

###### ARIZONA.

William B. Kelly, Clifton.  
Milville C. Hankins, Douglas.  
Otellia E. Buchanan, Fort Huachuca.  
Ethel M. Lacy, Gilbert.  
Lannes L. Ferrall, Grand Canyon.  
Charles Metcalfe, Kingman.  
Hugh E. Laird, Tempe.

###### ARKANSAS.

Logan Huppel, Truman.

###### CONNECTICUT.

George W. Fairgrieve, Bantam.  
William A. Hayes, Bristol.  
Daniel J. Kelley, Deep River.  
Patrick L. Shea, Derby.  
James W. Green, Eagleville.  
James F. Holden, Forestville.  
Edward B. Sullivan, Guilford.  
Daniel F. Finn, Jewett City.  
Nelson M. Watson, Kent.  
Clarence L. Clark, Lyme.  
Willis S. Gilbert, Ridgefield.  
George Forster, Rockville.  
Robert D. Burns, Saybrook.  
Harry W. Crane, Wethersfield.  
John G. St. Ruth, Windsor.  
John F. Oates, Windsor Locks.

###### GEORGIA.

James L. Heard, East Point.  
Jason Scarboro, Tifton.

###### IDAHO.

Frank Dvorak, Aberdeen.  
Willis M. Sears, Albion.  
Richard A. McDonald, Bovill.  
William Laurensen, Downey.  
Samuel D. Riggs, Emmett.  
Christopher O. Dice, Glenns Ferry.  
John F. Brown, Kendrick.  
Josephine Ervin, Mullan.  
George C. Jacobsen, Nampa.  
David O. Castater, Parma.  
Albert E. White, Payette.  
Floyd E. Reynolds, Richfield.  
Don C. D. Moore, Sandpoint.  
Ole P. Jensen, Shelley.  
Milo P. Strecker, Stites.  
Charles E. Mitchell, Wilder.

###### ILLINOIS.

Willis M. Humphreys, Alexis.  
Lottie M. Jones, Antioch.  
William H. Smith, Apple River.  
William Campbell, Athens.  
John Dooley, Belvidere.  
Edward J. Milligan, Bradley.  
James H. Bumsted, Carpentersville.  
Frank Johnston, Charleston.  
James Wyatt, Chrisman.  
James E. Simpson, Collinsville.  
Jesse J. Wesse, Dalton.  
Albert W. Hilboldt, Dongola.  
Max Geisenhoner, East Dubuque.  
John C. Kohn, Elgin.  
Robert W. Perkins, Erie.  
Alexander L. White, Fairmount.  
Bert J. Ritson, Farmington.  
Pearl A. Hollingsworth, Fisher.

Joseph H. Wagoner, Glenellyn.  
Albert P. Ferguson, Griggsville.  
William L. South, Hammond.  
Joseph W. Davis, Harrisburg.  
Charles F. McHenry, Hillsboro.  
Oren V. Grant, Hollywood.  
Robert L. Downing, Joy.  
Robert W. Briscoe, Kansas.  
Joseph H. Mulligan, Kewanee.  
Nora M. Aull, Kincaid.  
Francis A. Thomure, Livingston.  
Thomas J. Walsh, McHenry.  
George Reinemann, Madison.  
William G. Wack, Mansfield.  
Louis Wolter, Marissa.  
James R. Lewis, Mazon.  
Charles H. James, Meredosia.  
Calvin D. Miller, Milledgeville.  
Peter J. Yentes, Morton.  
Herman J. Hemann, New Baden.  
Edward C. Fahy, New Berlin.  
Ralph C. Waters, Newman.  
H. Bruce Shroyer, New Windsor.  
John M. Sheets, Oblong.  
Thomas P. McCann, Oglesby.  
William T. Clopper, Palo.  
James L. Mishler, Pearl City.  
W. Carroll Bush, jr., Pittsfield.  
Rolla L. Russell, Princeton.  
Elmer Lummis, Quincy.  
Albert Schrieber, Red Bud.  
Nathaniel J. Highsmith, Robinson.  
William W. Sloan, Rockton.  
Henry H. Pierce, Royalton.  
Richard J. Marlaire, St. Anne.  
John F. Knight, Sandoval.  
Timothy J. Kelly, Seneca.  
Sarah McGinnis, Shabbona.  
Edward P. Devine, Somonauk.  
Edward Streng, Stewardson.  
Kate M. Weis, Teutopolis.  
Henry S. Rolwing, Thebes.  
John Gilchrist, Utica.  
James E. Heffin, Versailles.  
George E. Combs, Villa Grove.  
Grove Harrison, Viola.  
Fay L. Quilter, Walnut.  
Charles J. Paar, Warsaw.  
Thomas J. Hopkins, Wenona.  
John H. Farquharson, Western Springs.  
John E. Wyatt, White Hall.  
Laura A. Gregory, Willisville.  
Timothy B. Lyons, Winchester.  
Charles E. Carlson, Woodhull.  
George W. Frame, Woodstock.  
Eber C. Burkett, Xenia.

###### INDIANA.

John L. Fraley, Anderson.  
John M. Wickizer, Argos.  
Nicholas Volz, Batesville.  
J. Ross Robertson, Brownstown.  
J. Clyde Davis, Carmel.  
Louis H. Kocher, Churubusco.  
Grover C. Luther, Clay City.  
Edward H. Taylor, Knox.  
George W. Roy, Wolcottville.  
Otto A. Minear, Claypool.  
Irvin A. Cox, Columbus.  
William H. Johnston, Crawfordsville.  
George A. Wilhelm, Dupont.  
Herbert P. Carpenter, Elwood.  
Guy Longest, English.  
John C. Ring, Frankton.  
Elmer Ritter, Fremont.  
Harry M. VanLear, Garrett.  
Daniel A. Riley, Greentown.  
Guy C. Hart, Kendallville.  
Maurice L. Cory, Kingman.  
Henry O. Eldridge, Lagrange.  
James P. Simons, Monticello.  
Frank D. Haimbaugh, Muncie.  
Charles Bates, New Carlisle.  
Elmer E. Stull, North Liberty.  
Frank W. Boren, Owensville.  
William F. Wake, Roanoke.

William T. Newton, Rosedale.  
 William A. Michael, St. Mary-of-the-Woods.  
 Charles M. Sparks, Shirley.  
 John T. Scott, Valparaiso.  
 Verner A. Hahn, Wakarusa.  
 Alden H. Baker, Westfield.  
 George P. De Hoff, Winona Lake.

## IOWA.

George F. Althouse, Ackley.  
 Patrick J. Grace, Adair.  
 Oscar M. Farb, Albert City.  
 Henry E. Button, Alden.  
 Lester R. Hudgel, Anthon.  
 William M. Bausch, Ashton.  
 John W. Blake, Atlantic.  
 Frank M. Beymer, Avoca.  
 Nicholas E. Sheridan, Bancroft.  
 Kenneth F. Baldrige, Bloomfield.  
 John R. Herron, Boone.  
 Lloyd L. Anspach, Bussey.  
 James B. Thompson, Casey.  
 Isaac T. Street, Center Point.  
 Edgar W. Penly, Central City.  
 James Steele, Clearfield.  
 Joseph C. Palmer, Clear Lake.  
 Oliver S. Barber, Creston.  
 Ezekiel S. Thompson, Eldora.  
 Gladys H. McDowell, Emerson.  
 William H. May, Exira.  
 Anthony J. Schreiber, Fort Atkinson.  
 Charles F. Irons, Garrison.  
 Dorothy Parden, George.  
 Amos Ingalls, Greene.  
 Robert A. Donahoe, Griswold.  
 Calvin P. Luther, Guttenberg.  
 Fred L. Ives, Hamburg.  
 Curran F. Swift, Harlan.  
 Arthur B. Peters, Hawkeye.  
 Albert F. Steffen, Hull.  
 Dennis A. Ray, Humboldt.  
 Charles H. Howe, Janesville.  
 George F. Smith, Keosauqua.  
 William J. Casey, Knoxville.  
 Stephen E. Magner, Lorimer.  
 Anna B. Berry, Marquette (late North McGregor).  
 John A. McNerney, Mount Ayr.  
 Fred H. Jamison, Oelwein.  
 L. Harold Neville, Orient.  
 George P. Martin, Peterson.  
 Joseph G. Geister, Primghar.  
 George Ritz, Rockwell City.  
 Sylva E. E. Thompson, Roland.  
 Clifford Bowman, Royal.  
 William H. Ward, Ryan.  
 Martin P. Klindt, St. Ansgar.  
 Therides V. Barnard, Schaller.  
 Edward M. Bratton, Shellsburg.  
 Everett T. McShane, Springfield.  
 Joseph J. McMahon, Toledo.  
 David F. Kirkpatrick, Wellman.  
 Edwin E. Cole, Woodbine.  
 Daniel J. Rhoads, Woodward.

## MAINE.

George H. Williams, Alfred.  
 Henry S. Perkins, Boothbay Harbor.  
 Franklin K. Jack, Bowdoinham.  
 Elwin A. Sampson, Brownville.  
 Isaiah G. Elder, Brunswick.  
 Mark P. Hamilton, Corinna.  
 James M. Haley, Cornish.  
 Blon B. Anderson, Dover.  
 Francis L. Talbot, East Machias.  
 Charles H. Leland, Ellsworth.  
 Gertrude S. Henneberry, Fort Fairfield.  
 James T. Kneeland, Harrison.  
 John H. Cooper, Kennebunk.  
 Wilbur F. Goodwin, Kennebunk Port.  
 George H. McIntosh, Lisbon Falls.  
 James L. Foster, Livermore Falls.  
 John Durgan, Lubec.  
 Donald L. Brown, Milo.  
 Carroll N. Staples, Norridgewock.  
 Irvin H. Ellis, North Anson.  
 Joseph W. Small, Northeast Harbor.  
 Theodore C. Haley, Rangeley.

George B. McMennamin, Rumford.  
 William K. Foster, South Windham.  
 Ray L. Lisherness, Stratton.  
 Rena M. Bates, Strong.  
 H. Clair Miller, Winthrop.  
 Sumner G. Brewer, Freeport.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Joseph F. McManus, Norwood.

## MICHIGAN.

Clarence C. Hopkins, Breckenridge.  
 Joseph M. Dodge, Cass City.  
 Sidney Reynolds, Howard City.  
 William B. Howlett, Jonesville.  
 Richard W. Doyle, Merrill.  
 Hiram A. Cole, Paw Paw.

## MINNESOTA.

Carlyle H. Day, Albert Lea.  
 Ennis N. Brandon, Annandale.  
 Oliver Erickson, Atwater.  
 Waiter C. Galbraith, Balaton.  
 Alexander J. Irwin, Belleplaine.  
 William E. Lawson, Benson.  
 William J. Murphy, Blue Earth.  
 John K. Jasper, Bovey.  
 Paul J. Johnson, Boyd.  
 Lambert Irsfeld, Browerville.  
 Ernest W. Rebstock, Buffalo Lake.  
 Mary E. Demel, Buhl.  
 Arthur M. Loberg, Cokato.  
 Ignatius Kremer, Cold Spring.  
 Ernest A. Schilling, Cottonwood.  
 Denis E. Murphy, Dassel.  
 Henry J. Bock, Delano.  
 John Engebretson, Elbow Lake.  
 Frank L. Frye, Elk River.  
 John M. Brown, Ely.  
 John Kasper, Faribault.  
 Edward C. Feely, Farmington.  
 John R. Norgren, Foreston.  
 Francis T. O'Gorman, Goodhue.  
 Frederick F. Achatz, Harmony.  
 Jerry Sullivan, Heron Lake.  
 Nels J. Enquist, Isanti.  
 Alphonso B. Kobe, Kelliher.  
 Elizabeth T. Uvaas, Kensington.  
 Ora M. Goodfellow, Kenyon.  
 Emily E. McGrath, Kinney.  
 Alice L. Eriksen, Lakefield.  
 James Lynch, Lanesboro.  
 George A. Boyd, Le Roy.  
 James M. Benson, Lindstrom.  
 John N. Gayner, Litchfield.  
 John O. Backman, Mabel.  
 Charles E. Wise, Mankato.  
 Steve Blanchett, Marshall.  
 James H. Pelham, Menahga.  
 Fred Gay, Moose Lake.  
 Ward J. Struble, Mora.  
 Peter W. Gorrie, Morristown.  
 Mary A. Mogren, Ortonville.  
 Sidney D. Wilcox, Park Rapids.  
 William A. Huntington, Paynesville.  
 Charles E. Gravel, Pierz.  
 Louis C. Stromberg, Red Wing.  
 Frederick S. Purdy, Russell.  
 Henry J. Essler, St. Peter.  
 Joseph A. Schoenhoff, Sauk Center.  
 Sadie A. Lane, Sherburn.  
 Richard F. Lamb, Slayton.  
 William R. Hodges, Sleepy Eye.  
 Bennie H. Holte, Starbuck.  
 Joseph J. Meighen, Twin Valley.  
 Jessie J. W. Hogue, Tyler.  
 George A. Phelps, Walker.  
 Fred T. Moody, Warroad.  
 John A. Timpone, Waterville.  
 Otto P. Miller, Welcome.  
 Frank M. Clark, Wells.  
 George E. LeTourneau, Windom.  
 Michael H. Baskfield, Zumbrota.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Kirk M. Heflin, Baldwyn.  
 Andrew J. Darden, Centerville.

## MISSOURI.

William A. Roberts, Belton.  
 James S. Divilbiss, Braymer.  
 Joseph A. Voelker, Clyde.  
 James E. Harris, Conway.  
 William Vogel, De Soto.  
 Carrie E. McCandless, Downing.  
 William B. Ellis, Elsberry.  
 Isaac P. Hopkins, Edgerton.  
 William P. Spillman, Grant City.  
 Violet V. Van Horn, Jerico Springs.  
 Fleety Palmer, Jonesburg.  
 Baylis Steele, Kansas City.  
 Peter McKee, Knox City.  
 Thomas E. Heatherly, La Grange.  
 Oliver P. Gentry, Liberty.  
 Clyde G. Eubank, Madison.  
 Zachariah T. Casebolt, Miami.  
 John C. Frazier, North Kansas City.  
 Leonidas P. Driskill, Oran.  
 Cris Ogden, Oronogo.  
 Collins J. Johnson, Palmyra.  
 William T. Murphy, Parma.  
 Bristol French, Piedmont.  
 William M. Brown, Polo.  
 Joseph K. Joiner, Richmond.  
 Delaus J. Buford, Rutledge.  
 William L. Peoples, Shelbyville.  
 Frances F. Hulett, Sturgeon.

## NEVADA.

Charles W. Brown, Gardnerville.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edwin M. Allen, Canaan.  
 Frank L. Marston, Conway.  
 George H. Sherry, Dover.  
 Samuel Runlett, Durham.  
 Elmer T. Ford, Hanover.  
 Duncan P. Noyes, Henniker.  
 George F. Sanborn, Meredith.  
 Philip W. Sherburne, Pittsfield.  
 Gardner Grant, Salmon Falls.  
 John A. Willey, Sanbornville.  
 Edward S. Perkins, Sunapee.

## NEW JERSEY.

James J. McAviney, Arlington.  
 Charles R. Grover, Atlantic Highlands.  
 William L. Scheuerman, Basking Ridge.  
 Walter H. Fish, Beverly.  
 Joseph A. Brady, Caldwell.  
 Sol Needles, Cape May.  
 Thomas Quinn, Chrome.  
 John Y. Bellis, Clinton.  
 John H. Lindemann, Closter.  
 Anna G. Rockhill, Columbus.  
 Patrick V. Doran, Convent Station.  
 Willard N. Apgar, Dunellen.  
 Harvey H. VanDerveer, Englishtown.  
 Alexander A. Yard, Farmingdale.  
 Frank N. Hughes, Florence.  
 Mary A. Hyde, Franklin.  
 Charles L. Kent, Hamburg.  
 James F. Gleason, Harrington.  
 Wilbur H. Le Compte, Haworth.  
 George E. Halladay, Manville.  
 Joseph Rezniczak, Maurer.  
 Joseph H. Barcklow, Moorestown.  
 Paul F. Edwards, Newfield.  
 James D. Moriarty, Orange.  
 Richard F. White, Perth Amboy.  
 David S. Pancoast, Pitman.  
 Harrison Hollinger, Port Norris.  
 William Gerard, Rockaway.  
 Joseph E. Harris, Roebbling.  
 S. Dana Ely, Rutherford.  
 Hiram H. Shepherd, South Boundbrook.  
 Philip E. Rockafellow, Stockton.  
 Joseph E. Charles, Wenonah.  
 Richard M. Crawford, Westville.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

Junius C. Wren, Siler City.  
 Adolphus S. Ruggles, Southern Pines.

## OHIO.

Michael J. Callaghan, Bellevue.

## OREGON.

John P. Houston, Vale.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

John C. Wiegel, Alliquippa.  
 John A. Miller, Arnold.  
 Fred H. Smith, Athens.  
 Francis B. Smeltzer, Avonmore.  
 Nelson O. Smith, Blawnox (late Hoboken).  
 Charles W. Krissinger, Berlin.  
 Michael C. Birmingham, Blossburg.  
 John J. McCormick, Bridgeport.  
 John A. McGinley, Bristol.  
 Richard O. Heilman, Catasauqua.  
 Thomas McCobb, Cochranston.  
 George W. Yost, Collegeville.  
 Augustus T. Groff, Confluence.  
 William L. Marshall, Dayton.  
 Harvey M. Bard, Denver.  
 Mertie T. Gillies, Devon.  
 Milton A. Miller, Elizabethville.  
 Patrick B. Eagan, Emporium.  
 Joseph R. Thurston, Factoryville.  
 Caroline E. W. Curry, Glen Olden.  
 Harby A. Koller, Glen Rock.  
 Francis E. Burke, Great Bend.  
 William Critchfield, Herminie.  
 J. Landis Strickler, Hummelstown.  
 Joseph C. Luman, Hyndman.  
 J. Bentley Candy, jr., Langhorne.  
 John D. May, Lapark.  
 Dorothy M. Shidler, Marianna.  
 Elias B. Leiby, Marysville.  
 Andrew J. Palm, Meadville.  
 Louis S. Bisky, Meshoppen.  
 Thomas W. Lauver, Milroy.  
 John T. Shipley, Meyersdale.  
 Joseph E. Niemoed, Mifflin.  
 Charles W. Rubendall, Millersburg.  
 Edward Weidenhamer, Milton.  
 William J. Burke, Mount Carmel.  
 Henry M. Good, New Castle.  
 Anna M. Frank, New Salem.  
 Andrew S. Knepp, North East.  
 Edward S. Laughlin, Oil City.  
 George N. Grumbein, Palmyra.  
 Howard Kemrer, Paradise.  
 Samuel J. Myers, Pen Argyl.  
 Edwin J. Wieder, jr., Pennsburg.  
 Phaon E. Sheidy, Pine Grove.  
 Laura W. Weaver, Republic.  
 Menzo M. Burt, Roulette.  
 Preston L. Peters, Saegerstown.  
 Eulalie D. Lockard, St. Davids.  
 John M. Ebling, Schuylkill Haven.  
 James P. Owens, Scottdale.  
 Clarence Reisinger, Sewickley.  
 Walter M. Clevenstine, Spring City.  
 John H. Custer, Stoyestown.  
 John V. McFadden, Summithill.  
 Hiram L. Purdy, Sunbury.  
 Oliver F. Wolf, Telford.  
 Clive S. Burtch, Tioga.  
 Charles L. Gibbs, Titusville.  
 Michael J. McNulty, Troy.  
 John B. Henning, Tunkhannock.  
 Percival E. Faust, Weatherly.  
 George D. Arner, Weissport.  
 Willis C. Kemp, West Middlesex.  
 John F. Mann, Wilcox.  
 Joseph M. Rutherford, Willow Grove.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Lucy H. Berndt, Ayon.  
 Robert H. Benner, Gary.

## VERMONT.

John Noble, Bethel.  
 Michael J. Moran, Brattleboro.  
 Herbert O. Bixby, Chelsea.  
 James B. Kimball, Enosburg Falls.  
 Calvin L. Gates, Morrisville.

Daniel R. Stetson, Newport.  
John L. Welsh, Proctor.  
Martha G. Kibby, Randolph Center.  
Frank H. Tyler, South Londonderry.  
Asa C. Oakes, Stowe.  
Andrew B. Anderson, Swanton.  
John H. Donnelly, Vergennes.

## WASHINGTON.

Joseph H. Gill, Washtucna.  
William L. Adams, Zillah.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Malichi J. Meadows, Beckley.  
Maurice R. Walker, Bramwell.  
Clarence L. Perkins, Gassaway.  
Joseph H. Long, Huntington.  
George A. Porter, Kenova.  
John E. Peck, Logan.  
Ida J. Garrison, Lost Creek.  
Willard Williams, Moorefield.  
James H. Bailey, Mount Hope.  
Joseph A. Wooddell, Pennsboro.  
Thomas W. Gocke, Piedmont.  
Edgar J. Loy, Romney.  
John L. Evans, Summersville.  
Stanhope M. Scott, Terra Alta.  
Earle Reger, Weston.

## WISCONSIN.

Frank E. Poll, Almond.  
Charles W. Steele, Beloit.  
John H. Levis, Black River Falls.  
Peter T. Moore, Brodhead.  
Henry E. Zimmermann, Burlington.  
Fred C. Schliesman, Cambria.  
John Cremer, Cashton.  
Carl Whitaker, Chetek.  
Ray C. Stewart, Clinton.  
Carrie Kautsky, Colby.  
Patrick J. Love, Coleman.  
William C. McMahon, Cumberland.  
Charles M. Tallman, Delavan.  
Herman Kronsehnabl, Dorchester.  
Henry Pattison, Durand.  
Clare L. Shearer, Eagle.  
John A. Zimpelmann, Eagle River.  
Lawrence Clancy, East Troy.  
Thomas D. Smith, Fairchild.  
Henry E. Steinbring, Fall Creek.  
Henry H. Gleason, Glenwood City.  
Raynold G. Lidbom, Grantsburg.  
Joseph L. O'Neil, Grays Mills.  
Joseph Marx, Hilbert.  
Henry R. Schumann, Kohler.  
Olas R. Skaar, La Crosse.  
George I. Richmond, Lodi.  
James O'Hara, Mazomanie.  
Ira B. Pierce, Monticello.  
Alois Goebel, Mount Horeb.  
Charles H. Farley, New Lisbon.  
Henry Knapstein, New London.  
John B. Kerrigan, Norwalk.  
William W. Sanders, Osceola.  
Julius E. Hennig, Princeton.  
Joseph Le Fevre, Pulaski.  
William H. Dunn, Rice Lake.  
Alfred H. Fischer, Ripon.  
Charles J. Knillans, Sharon.  
Russell D. Stouffer, Shell Lake.  
William D. Schultz, Stanley.  
Hubert A. Wagener, Sturgeon Bay.  
William Wagner, Thorp.  
Frederick Y. King, Tigerton.  
Elmer A. Peterson, Walworth.  
William Shenkenberg, Waterford.  
Arthur J. Dopp, Waukesha.  
Jens Davidson, Westby.

## WYOMING.

Conrad S. Vaterlaus, Cowley.  
Alfred F. Stott, Douglas.  
Finis E. Godfrey, Lander.  
Effie R. Spragg, Manville.  
James L. Masters, Torrington.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, June 5, 1920.

(Continuation of legislative day of June 4, 1920.)

The recess having expired, the House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

## THE BUDGET BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill that I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 14441. To provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that I may make a statement of what it contains.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with until he can make a statement of what it contains. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the bill that I send to the Clerk's desk is in all respects like the bill we passed, except that it provides that the comptroller general shall be appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States and the removal shall be vested in the Supreme Court, but it does not give the Senate the right of confirmation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. It is to conform to the suggestion made by the President—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not wish to discuss the constitutional but the practical phase of it. Has the gentleman any idea that the Supreme Court would undertake to perform the functions authorized in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I have no doubt of it. The Constitution provides—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that; you may attempt to make the Supreme Court the appointive power, but I express a confident doubt that the Supreme Court will carry it out. It is beneath the proprieties and dignity of this court, and I doubt if a single, solitary member of that court would undertake to discharge the function.

Mr. GOOD. I am making the request now, but if there is going to be objection—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not making objection, but simply calling attention to the fact that the Congress is undertaking to do a futile thing and that the Supreme Court will not discharge the function attempted to be imposed upon it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, of course I understand the situation which exists and I do not want to interfere with the public business in any way, but this is a very important matter, and does not the gentleman think we ought to have a larger attendance?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to put my request for the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, may I ask what the request now is?

The SPEAKER. The question now is for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14441) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc.,

## TITLE I.—DEFINITIONS.

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "budget and accounting act, 1920."

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

The terms "department and establishment" and "department or establishment" mean any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including the municipal government of the District of Columbia, but do not include the legislative branch of the Government or the Supreme Court of the United States;

The term "the budget" means the budget required by section 201 to be transmitted to Congress;

The term "bureau" means the bureau of the budget;

The term "director" means the director of the bureau of the budget; and

The term "assistant director" means the assistant director of the bureau of the budget.

## TITLE II.—THE BUDGET.

SEC. 201. The President shall transmit to Congress on the first day of each regular session the budget, which shall set forth in summary and in detail:

(a) Estimates of the expenditures and appropriations necessary in his judgment for the support of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year; except that the estimates for such year for the legislative branch of the Government and the Supreme Court of the United States shall be transmitted to the President on or before October 15 of each year, and shall be included by him in the budget without revision;

(b) His estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year, under (1) laws existing at the time the budget is transmitted and also (2) under the revenue proposals, if any, contained in the budget;

(c) The expenditures and receipts of the Government during the last completed fiscal year;

(d) Estimates of the expenditures and receipts of the Government during the fiscal year in progress;

(e) The amount of annual, permanent, or other appropriations, including balances of appropriations for prior fiscal years, available for expenditure during the fiscal year in progress, as of November 1 of such year;

(f) Balanced statements of (1) the condition of the Treasury at the end of the last completed fiscal year, (2) the estimated condition of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year in progress, and (3) the estimated condition of the Treasury at the end of the ensuing fiscal year if the financial proposals contained in the budget are adopted;

(g) All essential facts regarding the bonded and other indebtedness of the Government; and

(h) Such other financial statements and data as in his opinion are necessary or desirable in order to make known in all practicable detail the financial condition of the Government.

SEC. 202. (a) If the estimated receipts for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, on the basis of laws existing at the time the budget is transmitted, plus the estimated amounts in the Treasury at the close of the fiscal year in progress, available for expenditure in the ensuing fiscal year are less than the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, the President in the budget shall make recommendations to Congress for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate action to meet the deficiency.

(b) If the aggregate of such estimated receipts and such estimated amounts in the Treasury is greater than such estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year, he shall make such recommendations as in his opinion the public interests require.

SEC. 203. (a) The President from time to time may transmit to Congress supplemental or deficiency estimates for such appropriations or expenditures as in his judgment (1) are necessary on account of laws enacted after the transmission of the budget, or (2) are otherwise in the public interest. He shall accompany such estimates with a statement of the reasons therefor, including the reasons for their omission from the budget.

(b) Whenever they reach an aggregate which, if they had been contained in the budget, would have required the President to make a recommendation under subdivision (a) of section 202, he shall thereupon make such recommendation as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 204. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, the contents, order, and arrangement of the estimates of appropriations and the statements of expenditures and estimated expenditures contained in the budget or transmitted under section 203, and the notes and other data submitted therewith, shall conform to the requirements of existing law.

(b) Estimates for lump-sum appropriations contained in the budget or transmitted under section 203 shall be accompanied by statements showing, in such detail and form as may be necessary to inform Congress, the manner of expenditure of such appropriations and of the corresponding appropriations for the fiscal year in progress and the last completed fiscal year. Such statements shall be in lieu of statements of like character now required by law.

SEC. 205. The President, in addition to the budget, shall transmit to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1921, for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, only, an alternative budget, which shall be prepared in such form and amounts and according to such system of classification and itemization as is, in his opinion, most appropriate, with such explanatory notes and tables as may be necessary to show where the various items embraced in the budget are contained in such alternative budget.

SEC. 206. No estimate or request for an appropriation and no request for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request, and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met, shall be submitted to Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee of any department or establishment, unless at the request of either House of Congress.

SEC. 207. There is created a bureau to be known as the bureau of the budget. There shall be in the bureau a director and an assistant director. The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the director and the assistant director shall be appointed by the President. The assistant director shall receive an annual salary of \$10,000 and shall perform such duties as the President may designate. During the absence or incapacity of the director or during a vacancy in the office of director the President shall designate the Acting Secretary of the Treasury or the assistant director to act as director. The bureau, as may be directed by the President, shall prepare for him the budget, the alternate budget, and any supplemental or deficiency estimates, and to this end shall have authority to assemble, correlate, revise, reduce, or increase the estimates of the several departments or establishments.

SEC. 208. (a) The director or assistant director, as may be determined by the President, shall appoint and fix the compensation of such attorneys and other employees and make such expenditures for rent in the District of Columbia, printing, binding, telegrams, telephone service, law books, books of reference, periodicals, stationery, furniture, office equipment, other supplies, and necessary expenses of the office, as Congress may from time to time provide.

(b) No person appointed by the director or assistant director shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of \$5,000 a year, and not more than four persons so appointed shall be paid a salary at the rate of \$5,000 a year.

(c) All employees in the bureau whose compensation is at a rate less than \$5,000 a year shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations.

(d) The provisions of law prohibiting the transfer of employees of executive departments and independent establishments until after service of three years shall not apply during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, to the transfer of employees to the bureau.

SEC. 209. The bureau shall make a detailed study of the departments and establishments for the purpose of enabling the President to determine what changes (with a view of securing greater economy and efficiency in the conduct of the public service) should be made in (1) the existing organization, activities, and methods of business of such departments or establishments, (2) the appropriations therefor, (3) the assignment of particular activities to particular services, or (4) the re-grouping of services. The results of such study shall be embodied in a report or reports to the President, who may transmit to Congress such report or reports or any part thereof with his recommendations on the matters covered thereby.

SEC. 210. The bureau shall prepare for the President a codification of all laws or parts of laws relating to the preparation and transmission to Congress of receipts and expenditures of the Government and of estimates of appropriations. The President shall transmit the same to Congress on or before January 1, 1922, with a recommendation as to the changes which, in his opinion, should be made in such laws or parts of laws.

SEC. 211. The powers and duties relating to the compiling of estimates now conferred and imposed upon the division of bookkeeping and warrants of the office of the Secretary of the Treasury are transferred to the bureau. The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer to the bureau, at the rate of compensation received by them when this act takes effect, any officers or employees of such division who, in his opinion, are essential to the work of the bureau. The positions thus vacated shall not be filled, and the appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, shall lapse.

SEC. 212. The bureau shall, at the request of any committee of either House of Congress having jurisdiction over revenue or appropriations, furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

SEC. 213. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, (1) every department and establishment shall furnish to the bureau such information as the bureau may from time to time require, and (2) the director and the assistant director, or any employee of the bureau when duly authorized, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to, and the right to examine, any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department or establishment.

SEC. 214. (a) The head of each department and establishment shall designate an official thereof as budget officer therefor, who, in each year under his direction and on or before a date fixed by him, shall prepare the departmental estimates.

(b) Such budget officer shall also prepare, under the direction of the head of the department or establishment, such supplemental and deficiency estimates as may be required for its work.

SEC. 215. The head of each department and establishment shall revise the departmental estimates and submit them to the bureau on or before September 15 of each year. In case of his failure so to do, the President shall cause to be prepared such estimates and data as are necessary to enable him to include in the budget, estimates and statements in respect to the work of such department or establishment.

SEC. 216. The departmental estimates and any supplemental or deficiency estimates submitted to the bureau by the head of any department or establishment shall be prepared and submitted in such form, manner, and detail as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 217. For expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the bureau there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$225,000, to continue available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

## TITLE III. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

SEC. 301. There is created an establishment of the Government to be known as the general accounting office, which shall be independent of the executive departments and under the control and direction of the comptroller general of the United States. The offices of Comptroller of the Treasury and Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury are abolished, to take effect July 1, 1920. All other officers and employees of the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury shall become officers and employees in the general accounting office at their grades and salaries on July 1, 1920, and all books, records, documents, papers, furniture, office equipment, and other property of the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury shall become the property of the general accounting office. The comptroller general is authorized to adopt a seal for the general accounting office.

SEC. 302. There shall be in the general accounting office a comptroller general of the United States and an assistant comptroller general of the United States, who shall be appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and shall receive salaries of \$10,000 and \$7,500 a year, respectively. The assistant comptroller general shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the comptroller general, and during the absence or incapacity of the comptroller general, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as comptroller general.

SEC. 303. The comptroller general and the assistant comptroller general shall hold office during good behavior, but may be removed at any time by the Supreme Court of the United States after notice and hearing, when, in the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, the comptroller general or assistant comptroller general is incapacitated or inefficient, or has been guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and in no other manner except by impeachment. Any comptroller general or assistant comptroller general removed in the manner herein provided shall be ineligible for appointment to either of such offices. When a comptroller general or assistant comptroller general attains the age of 70 years he shall be retired from his office.

SEC. 304. All powers and duties now conferred or imposed by law upon the Comptroller of the Treasury or the six auditors of the Treasury Department, and the duties of the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants of the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury relating to keeping the personal ledger accounts of disbursing and collecting officers, shall, so far as not inconsistent with this act, be vested in and imposed upon the general accounting office and be exercised without direction from any other officer. The balances certified by the comptroller general shall be final and conclusive upon the executive branch of the Government. The revision by the comptroller general of settlements made by the six auditors shall be discontinued, except as to settlements made before July 1, 1920.

SEC. 305. Section 236 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 236. All claims and demands whatever by the United States or against them, and all accounts whatever in which the United States are concerned, either as debtors or creditors, shall be settled and adjusted in the general accounting office."

SEC. 306. All laws relating generally to the administration of the departments and establishments shall, so far as applicable, govern the

general accounting office. Copies of any books, records, papers, or documents, and transcripts from the books and proceedings of the general accounting office, when certified under its seal, shall be admitted as evidence with the same effect as the copies and transcripts referred to in sections 882 and 886 of the Revised Statutes.

Sec. 307. The comptroller general may provide for the payment of accounts or claims adjusted and settled in the general accounting office, through disbursing officers of the several departments and establishments, instead of by warrant.

Sec. 308. The duties now appertaining to the Division of Public Moneys of the office of the Secretary of the Treasury so far as they relate to the covering of revenues and repayments into the Treasury, the issue of duplicate checks and warrants, and the certification of outstanding liabilities for payment, shall be performed by the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants of the office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 309. The comptroller general shall prescribe the forms, systems, and procedure for administrative appropriation and fund accounting in the several departments and establishments, and for the administrative examination of fiscal officers' accounts and claims against the United States. He shall submit periodically to Congress reports upon the adequacy and effectiveness of the administrative examination of accounts and claims in the respective departments and establishments and upon the adequacy and effectiveness of departmental inspection of the offices and accounts of fiscal officers.

Sec. 310. The offices of the six auditors shall be abolished, to take effect July 1, 1920, but the then incumbents of those offices shall be transferred, at their present salaries, to become officers of the general accounting office. All other officers and employees of these offices shall become officers and employees in the general accounting office at their grades and salaries on July 1, 1920. All books, records, documents, papers, furniture, office equipment, and other property of these offices, and of the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants so far as they relate to the work of such division transferred by section 304, shall become the property of the general accounting office. The general accounting office shall occupy temporarily the rooms now occupied by the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the six auditors.

Sec. 311. (a) The comptroller general shall appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such attorneys and other employees in the general accounting office as may from time to time be provided for by Congress.

(b) All such appointments, except to positions carrying a salary at a rate of more than \$5,000 a year, shall be made in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations.

(c) No person appointed by the comptroller general shall be paid a salary at a rate of more than \$6,000 a year, and not more than four persons shall be paid a salary at a rate of more than \$5,000 year.

(d) Until March 5, 1921, no person who at the time of the passage of this act holds office as one of the six auditors, and who in pursuance of section 310 is transferred to the general accounting office, shall be removed from office or have his compensation reduced, except for cause.

(e) All officers and employees of the general accounting office, whether transferred thereto or appointed by the comptroller general, shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by him.

(f) All official acts performed by such officers or employees specially designated therefor by the comptroller general shall have the same force and effect as though performed by the comptroller general in person.

(g) The comptroller general shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying on the work of the general accounting office, including rules and regulations concerning the admission of attorneys to practice.

Sec. 312. (a) The comptroller general shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds, and shall make to the President when requested by him, and to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing of the work of the general accounting office, containing recommendations concerning the legislation he may deem necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds as he may think advisable. In such regular report, or in special reports at any time when Congress is in session, he shall make recommendations looking to greater economy or efficiency in public expenditures.

(b) He shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The comptroller general shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

(c) The comptroller general shall specifically report to Congress every expenditure or contract made by any department or establishment in any year in violation of law.

Sec. 313. All departments and establishments shall furnish to the comptroller general such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the comptroller general, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department or establishment. The authority contained in this section shall not be applicable to expenditures made under the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes.

Sec. 314. The Civil Service Commission shall establish an eligible register for accountants for the general accounting office, and the examinations of applicants for entrance upon such register shall be based upon questions approved by the comptroller general.

Sec. 315. (a) All appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, for the offices of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the six auditors, are transferred to and made available for the general accounting office.

(b) During the fiscal year the comptroller general, within the limit of the total appropriations available for the general accounting office, may make such changes in the number and compensation of officers and employees appointed by him or transferred to the general accounting office under this act as may be necessary.

(c) There shall also be transferred to the general accounting office such portions of the appropriations for rent and contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including allotments for printing and binding, made for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, as are equal to the amounts expended from similar appropriations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, by the Treasury Department for the offices of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the six auditors.

(d) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the appropriations and portions of appropriations referred to in this section shall be available for salaries and expenses of the general accounting offices, including payment for rent in the District of Columbia, traveling expenses, the purchase and exchange of law books, books of reference, and for all necessary miscellaneous and contingent expenses.

Sec. 316. The general accounting office shall not be construed to be a bureau or office created since January 1, 1916, so as to deprive employees therein of the additional compensation allowed civilian employees under the provisions of section 6 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, if otherwise entitled thereto.

Sec. 317. The provisions of law prohibiting the transfer of employees of executive departments and independent establishments until after service of three years shall not apply during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, to the transfer of employees to the general accounting office.

Sec. 318. This act shall take effect July 1, 1920, but appointments to offices herein created may be made prior to that date, to take effect July 1, 1920.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the discussion of sections 302 and 303 of the reintroduced budget bill, which is now permitted by unanimous consent, it seems to me that we are here presented with a studied effort to so affront the Executive as to make impossible the proper performance of the manifold provisions of the budget. On yesterday we had the action of the House sustaining the presidential veto. Now they come in with a greater limitation on the power of the Chief Executive of the United States, the man who is responsible for the success of the budget system, and place the power of appointment and the power of removal of certain essential budget officers in the Supreme Court of the United States. If there ever was an attempted perversion of the duties of the Supreme Court of the United States, in appointment and removal of the comptroller of the budget system, an Executive function, it is now made manifest in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I know the gentleman does not want to make a mistake in his statement. This bill gives the President the power to appoint the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is made director of the budget. It gives the President the power to appoint the assistant in the budget office, and he does that without the consent or advice of the Senate. This is another office, an independent office of auditing.

Mr. GARD. I understand what it is. It is said by proponents of this plan to be authorized by section 2, article 2, of the Constitution, where it provides—

But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

It is my opinion that it is made on a misapprehension of the constitutional meaning. The constitutional provision means that in Executive functions the President is the man in whom should repose the power of appointment and removal, and the responsibility of conduct of the appointed official while in office.

"In the courts of law," which is the second subdivision, the Constitution means that the courts of law may appoint the inferior officers of the court in order that the business of the court may be properly carried on, so that they may be responsible for the conduct and actions of their inferior officers, and make for the best administration of justice through litigated causes.

The third subdivision means that the heads of departments, in order that the minor duties may be properly carried out, may appoint their inferior officers. And there we have summed up in this great instrument, the Constitution of the United States, a distinct statement, safeguarding the interests of the people in the departments and in their administration by the appointment of inferior officers in the three divisions of the executive, the courts of law, and the heads of the departments.

It is impossible, in my opinion, by any process of reasoning to justify the placing of this political power in the Supreme Court of the United States. We have always been fond of believing here in the United States, and I believe it now, that the courts of the land, headed by the Supreme Court of the United States, constitute the great bulwark of defense of our national institutions and of public and private welfare, and it seems to me impossible to reconcile with reason any attempted expediency of having the Supreme Court of the United States appoint the comptroller general of the budget and the assistant comptroller general. It will plunge the Supreme Court, which we always regarded as free from politics, absolutely into all that politics and partisan politics may mean. It is a thing which never should be considered, and the sum total of it, as it now appeals to me, seems to be that those who framed this bill are so intent on unduly limiting the power of the Executive that they

are willing to take a chance of wrecking the necessary working machinery of the budget, which has been asked for by many who have sincerely at heart the best interests of the country. There is but one proposition. The bill with the new language to which I have called attention must not pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. HUDDLESTON (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the conferring upon the Supreme Court the power to appoint this officer imposes upon that court the discharge of executive or administrative functions that are obviously of a political or semipolitical character, functions never heretofore discharged by that tribunal, and which I confidently believe it should never under any circumstances undertake to perform. It is the duty of this House thoroughly to consider this question before it embarks upon so radical a departure.

The Federal Government is one of limited and separated powers. It is elementary that all the powers of our Government are granted by the Constitution and are bestowed upon three great divisions or departments of government. The legislative power is given to the Congress, the executive or administrative power is given to the President, and "the judicial power" is given to the Supreme Court and inferior courts. Each division or department is supreme in its field or jurisdiction, and no one of these departments can take from or add to the other. Their separation and independence is almost the saving genius of our institutions, and the common instinct of our people has always contended that liberty, order, and democracy can only be preserved and promoted by a rational application of this great principle of division and separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, the reputable publicists and the unbroken decisions of our courts declare our Federal Government to be one of limited powers, having no powers except those expressly conferred or arising by necessary implication or powers essential to carrying into effect such expressed or implied powers. Let us see what is granted to the Federal courts of our Republic. Article 3, section 1 of the Constitution prescribes that all—

The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

From this language it is manifest that the supreme and inferior courts of the United States possess no power save that which is in terms declared to be "judicial power," and the expressed grant of judicial power to the courts of necessity excludes therefrom all power not judicial in its nature and character. Obviously the appointment of auditing and accounting officials by the Supreme Court is not the exercise of a judicial power, but plainly and palpably is, in the very nature of things, the exercise of administrative or political power, which is expressly conferred either upon the executive or legislative department of the Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not follow an unbroken path in reaching the proper interpretation of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as related to the matter under consideration. In the case of the United States against Ferreira (13 Howard, p. 40), the Supreme Court held that an act of Congress authorizing the district judge of Florida to pass upon certain claims, which decisions were to be reported to the Secretary of the Treasury for his discretionary action thereupon, did not confer judicial but administrative powers. The opinion of the court declares that—

The powers conferred by these acts of Congress upon the judge, as well as the Secretary, are, it is true, judicial in their nature; for judgment and discretion must be exercised by both of them. But it is nothing more than the power ordinarily given by law to a commissioner appointed to adjust claims to lands or money, under a treaty; or special powers to inquire into or decide any particular class of controversies in which the public or individuals may be concerned. A power of this description may constitutionally be conferred on a Secretary as well as a commissioner, but is not judicial in either case, in the sense in which judicial power is granted by the Constitution to the courts of the United States.

Again, in an earlier and more celebrated case, known as the Hayburn case (2 Dallas, p. 409), the courts passed upon a question almost wholly analogous to that now under discussion. In that case the Federal courts were authorized by Congress to perform certain administrative acts in relation to the claims of invalid pensioners and to submit their findings for revision to

the Secretary of War. The case was never passed upon by the Supreme Court because the act was repealed before it could be finally considered. But in the meantime the question was decided by three United States circuit courts; in one case the Chief Justice and an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court sat; in the second, two Associate Justices of the Supreme Court sat; and in the third, one Associate Justice sat, making five of the six members of the Supreme Court, and in each case an opinion was rendered denying the right of Congress to impose upon the courts any such duties. In these cases letters were addressed by the court to the President of the United States setting forth their declination to undertake the service assigned them by the Congress, and discussing the whole question with great propriety, dignity, and ability. The sum and substance of these three several opinions are found in the inevitable conclusion of the circuit court, composed of Justices Wilson and Blair and District Judge Peters, that—

The business directed by this act is not of a judicial nature. It forms no part of the power vested by the Constitution in the courts of the United States; the circuit court must, consequently, have proceeded without constitutional authority.

Therefore it seems too plain for further argument that the duties assigned to the Supreme Court by the bill now under consideration are duties in no wise of a judicial nature or character, and therefore the legislative department of the Government is undertaking to give to the Supreme Court power other than that which is judicial, as contemplated by the Constitution, and consequently the provision in question is unauthorized by that instrument.

But this argument is resisted by the suggestion that the provisions of the second paragraph of section 2 of Article II of the Constitution in relation to appointments does specifically vest appointments of this character "in the courts of law." The exact language of the Constitution is found in the section authorizing the President to make appointments, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and particularly in the conclusion of the section which declares—

but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

I doubt whether the words "courts of law" found in this section include the Supreme Court of the United States. When speaking of the Federal courts the average man, both lawyer and layman, thinks only of the "inferior Federal courts," nisi prius courts, such as the district and circuit courts of our system. The Supreme Court of the United States always comes to our minds as an institution of itself, solitary and alone in its dignity and majesty. But if I am mistaken in this construction, I can not be mistaken in the conclusion that the power of appointment by the courts must be of such a character as is inherently incident to the exercise of judicial power by the courts themselves. The courts have never hesitated to perform certain administrative acts, when these acts are inherently essential to the exercise of a judicial function. For example, the mere creation of a court would give it the right to appoint clerks, marshals, tipstiffs, masters, receivers, and officers of like character. And thus far alone, I submit, do we find the authority to make appointments by the "courts of law."

As throwing light upon the construction of the authority granted by the Constitution, I ask any gentleman here to tell me how we can compel the Supreme Court to perform the duties assigned by this bill. If the court does not make the appointment, then, how can it be compelled to do so? And if we can not compel it to do so, is this not almost a complete affirmation that we have not the jurisdiction to confer the power? I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion the words "in the courts of law" mean only nisi prius courts?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should have qualified the words "nisi prius courts" by saying all courts except the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Would the gentleman then say that the Congress would not have the power to give the Supreme Court the right to appoint its own clerk as an inferior officer of the court?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not hold that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They would have to have it under this provision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an inherent power of the Supreme Court. When you originate the Supreme Court you give it

power to function, and it could not function unless it had the right to appoint its own court officers. That is a very distinct question from the one now under consideration.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Would not that power under this article of the Constitution be giving Congress the right to delegate to courts of law the power to appoint inferior officers?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not the time to argue that question with the gentleman; I differ with him on that point. I do not think for the reasons I have heretofore advanced that the "courts of law" mean the Supreme Court of the United States in the ordinary acceptance, or if the words quoted do include the Supreme Court, they must be interpreted as confining the appointments to those of a judicial character, as I have heretofore argued.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, how would Congress force the President to appoint an officer whom we authorized him to appoint if he fails to do it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman's question is the one I put just now, and the answer is, how?

Mr. CRAMTON. We can not force the President any more than we can force the Supreme Court.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We can not force the President, but we are not discussing the President now; I am speaking of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman thinks because we can not force the Supreme Court we can not give them—

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is one of the reasons why we should not give it.

I ask consideration of the House of two practical aspects of this question. First, how will these appointments be made, and how will the removals be accomplished? Manifestly, the appointments will be made by the Supreme Court very much as they are now made by the executive or administrative officers. That is to say, the appointing power will have to ascertain the names and qualifications of the applicants, and the usual process of recommendations, interviews, and persuasions will be either attempted or indulged in. Removal of this comptroller and assistant comptroller will be accompanied by even greater acrimony and partisanship, thus lowering the Supreme Court in the confidence of the public, no matter how disinterested and courageous it may be in the discharge of this duty. In other words, the judicial function of necessity will become an administrative function, and the method of procedure in making appointments and removals will be of a character similar to that exercised by the executive or administrative officers. This procedure we all know is administrative and semipolitical at least, and of necessity will violate that propriety and dignity which has heretofore invested our Supreme Court, and has preserved it from the corrosion of politics. I am in favor of the budget system, but it is far more important to preserve the Supreme Court in the confidence of the American people, to preserve it from all suspicion of political or partisan action, than it is to pass any budget system for the Government. [Applause.]

The chief hope of the American Republic is the existence and preservation of the Supreme Court and our juridical system in its original purity and vigor. No budget system should be obtained at the expense of our juridical institutions. The instant Congress authorizes the Supreme Court to make appointments of administrative officers that minute the Congress has done a thing which ought not to be done.

But, Mr. Speaker, however abhorrent the provision of this bill may be to me, my apprehensions are not very grave, for advertising now to the second practical aspect of the question I desire to observe, in conclusion, that the Supreme Court will never undertake to do what this bill authorizes it to do. That court will observe its traditional propriety, it will observe its historic dignity, by respectfully declining to undertake to perform the duties authorized by the provision now under discussion. This court, unless I am grievously mistaken, will do as it has heretofore done; that is to say, it will decline to make these appointments, knowing that such a declination is the only safe path it may pursue to preserve its judicial ermine free from the soil and taint of partisan politics. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. I am going to insist on a quorum being here if the gentleman from Iowa is going to sidetrack the deficiency bill and try to railroad through a constitutional proposition in a few minutes without a proper amount of debate. Why not withdraw this bill and put through the deficiency bill—

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield, there is no sidetracking of anything. The deficiency bill is not here, and we are waiting to get it.

Mr. WINGO. Here is a proposition that involves a constitutional question, and one can not get time to discuss it. You propose to ram it through here in a few moments' time, and I am not going to stand it.

Mr. MONDELL. Nobody has any purpose of ramming it through.

Mr. WINGO. Yes you have, actually. You have a situation where the gentleman in charge of the bill is offering gentlemen three minutes to discuss a constitutional question.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman realizes—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend a moment for the Chair to submit a personal request?

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan requests leave of absence for balance of week on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks upon the subject on which I just spoke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. What is the status of the deficiency bill? The river and harbor bill and the deficiency bill are the only two supply bills out.

The SPEAKER. They have been signed by the Speaker.

Mr. WINGO. Both of them?

The SPEAKER. Both of them.

Mr. WINGO. So there is not a single supply bill that is in danger. All right, Mr. Speaker. If we can not have time to discuss this, I am going to insist upon a quorum being present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a statement as to appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent—

Mr. WINGO. Well, Mr. Speaker, we may just as well thrash this out now. I am perfectly willing to waste time if the gentleman is not willing to grant anybody time on this question. I have been here for a week every hour helping to get through, and even though I wanted to make a speech a little political I have deferred in order to get these supply bills out of the way.

Now the gentleman comes in here and offers a few moments of time when we have got over five hours before adjournment, with all the supply bills out of the way. If the gentleman wants to grant liberal debate, I will not insist upon my point of no quorum, but if we are going to get through, with our supply bills out of the way, no public necessity to be served by haste and no public interest will suffer if this House adjourns right now, if the gentleman is going to have a political field day here, let him treat all parties alike and divide up the time—

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman I propose to yield one-half of the time to those who are opposed to this proposition and one-half to those who are in favor of it, and I am not going to yield more than five minutes to anybody. If the gentleman wants five minutes, I shall be very glad to cut that off my own time and yield it to the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time does that involve in the discussion of this question?

Mr. GOOD. One hour.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I do not make any pretensions of being a constitutional lawyer, but I would like to see a constitutional lawyer discuss a constitutional question in five minutes. Certainly a man with no more ability than I possess could not discuss a constitutional question in five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. The request I have submitted is one that has been granted to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for unanimous consent to extend remarks on the subject of appropriations.

Mr. WINGO. And always both under Republican and Democratic rule we have used a little spirit of fairness in the closing hours and not shown a lack of regard for the proprieties.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if he would not be entirely willing, and also ask the gentleman from Iowa if he would not be willing in the event it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Arkansas, to extend the debate for, say, half an hour, so as to give an hour and a half for this discussion?

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection.

Mr. WINGO. I will say this: If the gentleman will throw this proposition open to the House for a fair chance to amend it,

I shall not object. It strikes me as so outrageous to drag the Supreme Court of the United States into an effort, which I think is a mean, petty, partisan effort, to slap the President of the United States in the face, that I shall not stand for it. It is an outrageous performance. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of appropriations.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I object to that until we get some arrangement that is satisfactory. We have lots of time, five hours.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman state his desire?

Mr. WINGO. For the gentleman to throw it open to amendment, so those who are opposed to it can have a chance at it. I want to say to the gentleman I am for a budget, but I want a real budget, not loaded down with a provision contrary to the Constitution, and which denies the President the power granted to him by the Constitution.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] a substitute for the provision relative to the appointment of the comptroller and assistant comptroller?

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman mean if I have one prepared?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. No; but it is obvious to every man.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman understands the Budget Committee met last evening, the Republican and Democratic members of the committee, and unanimously agreed upon this?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is not fair when he says this is an attempt to slap the President. There is no such thought.

Mr. BARKLEY. Nobody in this House knew what this was until 10 o'clock this morning when the House met.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's side is very well represented on the Budget Committee. The gentlemen have given this matter careful consideration, and met last night and agreed unanimously.

Mr. BARKLEY. We went home last night shortly after 1 o'clock and did not know anything about this matter until this morning.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum unless this proposition to drop the appointment of this budget officer by the Supreme Court is agreed to. I shall make it unless that is done.

Mr. GOOD. Let me ask the minority leader and the gentlemen who are objecting to this proposed legislation a question. I have no desire to embarrass anyone. I am, of course, very anxious to put this constructive piece of legislation on the statute books. I believe that we ought to pass this bill to-day. I have tried during all the discussion of this matter to approach it in a spirit of fairness and with the kindest spirit toward the President. Now, I want to ask the gentlemen on this side of the House if they are willing to amend this provision, if there is serious objection to the bill in its present form—and I take it that you are sincere in your objection—by providing for the appointment of the comptroller general and the assistant comptroller general by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate? [Cries of "Yes!"] I think it greatly weakens the bill to give to the Executive—I do not care whether he is a Republican, Socialist, or what not—the power to appoint this independent officer who, by the very nature of things, if he performs his full duty, will have to criticize the executive department. But I am perfectly willing to waive that in the interest of the still greater importance of the legislation, which I think transcends in importance all other legislation of this session. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have two or three minutes.

Mr. WINGO. I withdraw my point for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman from Iowa control the time?

Mr. MONDELL. He does, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I will take three minutes of it.

Mr. GOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] would give heed. We never intend, if we can prevent it by any fair means, that this bill shall pass containing the authority for the Supreme Court to appoint anything or anybody. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is very little opposition in the House to the budget plan. Of course, there is a difference of opinion about what it will amount to. The authority to appoint the officers of this Government has always been vested in the President. Now, if you will fix it so that it

gives this appointing power back to the President, then we will withhold the point of no quorum and get this bill through, if you will do it right now.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a letter of Postmaster General Burleson to Mr. Charles T. Gwynne, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, in which he gives some statistics as to the compensation of employees in the Postal Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if that is a similar letter to the one I desired to offer here one morning, and to which the gentleman objected on the ground that it would encumber the Record?

Mr. BLACK. No.

Mr. KING. I desire to heap coals of fire on the gentleman's head, and I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Elks' revolving fund for disabled soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the hydroelectric bill and on the subject of farmers' cooperation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the report of investigation recently had with reference to the Attorney General's transactions in regard to Louisiana sugar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the sugar question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Government wire control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the Navy. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill (H. R. 10011) authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on appropriations and on the legislation of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on appropriations and legislation of the Congress. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of general legislation in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of general legislation in Congress. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on matters of interest to national banks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on matters of interest to national banks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks on the general subject of agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of agriculture. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in an explanation as to why this Congress has failed to reduce the cost of the necessities of life.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the high cost of living. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of agriculture and also on the subject of rural credits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the so-called Mason resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Mason resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, very briefly, on the record of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the record of this Congress. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SESSION EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution authorizing the payment of the compensation of session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives for the month of June, 1920, on the 5th day of said month.

Be it resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized and directed to pay to the session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives borne on the session roll their respective salaries for the month of June, 1920, on the 5th day of said month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had receded from its amendment No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 4 to the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; also

The Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate No. 18.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument marking the starting point of the motor convoy from Washington to San Francisco;

H. R. 6407. An act for the relief of Michael MacGarvey;

H. R. 10011. An act authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather;

H. R. 10183. An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13962. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3747. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 11224. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918;

H. R. 9281. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 11554. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 10515. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 7775. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 3747. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming submits the following motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MONDELL submitted the following motion:

"That LOUIS T. MCFADDEN, Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, does this take me off the floor?

The SPEAKER. No.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the legislation of the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the legislation of the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINIRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on general legislation, and particularly on the Mason resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a speech delivered on Decoration Day, May 30, at Pittsburgh, Pa., by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech of Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, delivered on Decoration Day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting certain remarks delivered by my colleague, Mr. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting a speech delivered by his colleague, Mr. WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of national aid to agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of national aid to agriculture. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the Armenian resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the subject of the legislation and record of Democratic Congresses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the legislation and record of Democratic Congresses. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Mason bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the Record a letter written by my colleague [Mr. VENABLE] on the railroad bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

MARCH 19, 1920.

Mr. ———,  
Meridian, Miss.

MY DEAR —: I welcome the opportunity to write you a letter answering the questions in your mind about the railroad bill, and giving you my reasons for believing that its passage was best for the country; that a failure to pass a bill would have brought disaster. Of course, all legislation is a compromise of conflicting views and the question for the legislator always is (in the event that some bill must be passed) not whether the proposed measure is perfect, but whether it is the best one obtainable under all the circumstances.

Now, in order that the answers to the questions may be clear, I wish to call to mind a bit of history. Prior to the war, 39½ per cent of Class I railroads were in the hands of receivers. In other words, they had been unable to earn enough to operate and pay interest on the debts they owed, with the results that to keep them from being sold under mortgages securing their notes and bonds, the courts had to take them over and operate them for the benefit of creditors. This meant that all improvements had to stop, all men discharged who could be gotten rid of, and only those things done which were absolutely necessary to keep the road moving after a sorry fashion. The war came on, there was a tremendous increase in traffic, and the need of equipment was imperative. The railroads could not finance themselves or borrow money, both because of their bad prewar condition and also because the Government was absorbing all the credit of the country in the sale of Liberty bonds. The railroads could not carry on the war with their equipment and could not get the money to buy equipment. This and the necessity for consoli-

dated operation, in order to most economically use the equipment on hand, made it necessary for the Government to take over their operation. The Government took them over, operated them as one system, tore their business organizations all to pieces, and did whatever was necessary to be done in order to operate them most efficiently for the good of the country and the winning of the war.

All told, the Government put \$1,900,000,000 into the railroads of the country. A large part of this sum is to be returned by the railroads, having been loaned to them for the purchase of equipment, betterments, etc. To make a long story short, after these loans are returned, the net loss to the people of the country, which they have had to pay out of their pockets in addition to advanced freight rates and passenger rates, amounts to \$645,000,000—net loss from Government control and operation of the railroads during the war period; and, indeed, the people will eventually have to pay the whole \$1,900,000,000, for the reason that the Government money to be paid back by the railroads must be earned from hauling freight and passengers, and the people must pay it, whether it comes out of the Federal Treasury or the freight paid to the railroads by the citizens, all of which enters into the cost of articles to the consumers.

During the period of Government control only 57 of the 175 class No. 1 railroads earned interest on what they owed, and only a few paid dividends; 108 of them did not earn their interest, and, of course, could not pay dividends.

Anyone can see from these figures, which are undisputed, that if the railroads were turned back to their owners without the Government financing them in some way that within 30 days nearly all of them would be bankrupt or in the hands of receivers, with the result that thousands of workers would be thrown out of employment, railroad operation, which is the life blood of the country, would have been in a state where it would almost cease to flow, and the country would have been also in the hands of receivers and in the throes of bankruptcy.

Aside from any question of justice to the owners of the railroads, the country had to put the railroads on a sound financial basis as a matter of self-defense to avoid disaster to the entire citizenship of the country. Now, there were two possible ways to finance the railroads—one out of the Federal Treasury, by giving or lending money raised from the people by taxation, and the other by fixing freight rates at such a figure that the railroads on their tonnage might be permitted to earn enough to take care of their obligations, keep their roads in a healthy condition, and afford a fair return to their owners.

To accomplish this the Congress adopted and the bill provided a method according to the second plan. The Congress agreed that 5½ per cent was a fair return to the owners, and instructed the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix a schedule of rates at such a figure that it would produce enough to operate the railroads, pay employees, and so forth, and yield 5½ per cent on the value of the road. This does not mean the capitalization, but the real value as fixed by the commission. In this way watered-stock valuation is to be eliminated, and it is to be fixed to yield this return under proper and economical management.

Now, for the purposes of valuation, the commission was empowered to take the roads as a whole or divide them into groups, and the rate was to be fixed with reference to the value of the group together, or the whole together. It is not true that the Government guarantees a 5½ per cent return. It is simply a rule of rate making, and if the railroad does not make it the Government does not make up the deficit. For illustration, suppose that the commission puts two roads into the same group for valuation purposes, one worth one million and the other worth two million dollars. The commission, under the terms of the bill, fixes the rates to be charged by the railroads mentioned at such figures in its several items as will, with proper management, yield 5½ per cent on \$3,000,000. Now, suppose that the first road, by superior management, economy, and energy, earns 10 per cent on its value of one million and the second road only earns 1 per cent. The Government does not make up the difference for the second road. After the rate is fixed the concern of the Government ends.

Before I pass on, permit me to say that, under the bill as passed, if a railroad makes more than the percentage of value allowed—more than 5½ or 6 per cent—the excess is taken to the extent of one-half and is placed in a special fund controlled by the Railroad Commission, to be loaned to railroads needing credit, upon security approved by the United States Treasury, to be repaid with interest and to be expended for approved railroad improvements. While a rate is to be fixed under which it is possible for a road to get 5½ per cent on its true value, if it should happen to make more than this, one-half of the excess earnings goes to the Government for a special fund for financing worthy railroad projects. Under the old system, while some

roads did not make a living under existing rates, others made very large returns. The bill as passed goes on the theory that all the owners of the railroads in the exercise of a public franchise are entitled to a reasonable return, and if it makes more than this it must give half of it to the Government toward the creation of a revolving fund to be used for the development of the railroads of the country.

There is nothing of a guaranty to the owners in the matter. It is simply a rule of rate making within the power of Congress, and one that it has been exercising through its ministerial agent, the Interstate Commerce Commission, ever since that body has been created. The Supreme Court has held that the rates fixed by the commission, to be constitutional, must yield a reasonable return and not be confiscatory; and so all along in fixing rates the commission, as Congress could have done, has been making a rate to yield a certain character of return to the owners of the roads. In this case Congress, instead of leaving it to its agent to fix the rate, has told the agent what it considered necessary.

No one can contend that 5½ per cent is an unreasonably large return on the money invested. Our State recognizes as high as 8 per cent as being reasonable, and I see no reason why the man with money invested in railroads is entitled to receive nothing.

Now, I wish to call your attention to this fact, that this so-called guaranty, or rule of rate making, is a device to finance the railroads during this reconstruction period, and applies for only two years from the date of passing the bill. After that the old rules apply, of leaving the matter with the commission, as formerly.

Now, let us bear this in mind, that in any view of the question, or under any method of operation, these roads had to be financed and had to be placed on a sound basis, if disaster was to be avoided and the roads of the country, upon which the prosperity of the whole Nation depends, were to be permitted to grow and expand with the expanding needs of the country.

I have heard some general criticism of the so-called guaranty in general terms—some rather violent ones, generally or largely by those who had not studied the bill or were laboring under a misconception as to its terms, but no one, as far as I have been able to learn, has proposed a way out or suggested a way by which it could have been done otherwise than by direct taxation of the people with its additional burdens to those already heavy.

In short, it was a case of financing the railroads or having them crash, with the citizenship of the country injured in the crash.

Now, this was the situation: To begin with, when the railroads were first taken over by the Government, Government control was to be terminated by proclamation of the President, and when he had made it, under the law it was irrevocable. He did make it, and set the 1st of March for the roads to go back. They had to go back, law or no law, unless Congress passed an act continuing Government control. So two courses were open: (1) Return them to their owners with proper provisions for their sound operation; or else (2) pass a bill continuing Government control and operation for all time or for a period.

Let us examine this. There would have been no reason for continued Government operation unless as a basis for Government ownership and permanent operation, either by the Government itself or by some agency set up by it. This is especially true in view of the fact that they were losing money all the time. We could take the roads and operate them temporarily under war emergency, paying the owners for the use of them, but we could not do this permanently unless we bought the roads from the owners—outright or by condemnation. To buy the railroads would cost from fifteen to twenty billion dollars, depending on the elements of value that were allowed by the courts.

This money would have to be raised either by taxation, which would be impossible, or else by the sale of bonds, or by having the owners accept the bonds in lieu of money.

No one would think of raising twenty or even fifteen billion dollars at one time by taxation, so we will lay this aside, and pass to the question of getting the roads by the sale of bonds, and it is the same whether the owners were paid in bonds or the bonds were sold and the owners paid in money, as far as certain results were concerned.

To any one familiar with the financial condition of the country, with an outstanding indebtedness of twenty-six billions of dollars, billions of bonds already selling under par in the market, the small denomination bonds circulating as currency with the effect of inflation, the people already heavily taxed to pay interest and provide a sinking fund to pay principal on maturity, it needs no long reasoning to demonstrate that if, on top of this, we inflate the currency still further by putting another twenty billion on top of the twenty-six we have already, making

a grand total of national indebtedness of forty-six billion dollars, that financial disaster would be sure to overcome us, that the added taxation necessary to pay the interest on these additional bonds and provide a sinking fund to pay the principal at maturity would break the backs of the people with its grievous burden, send prices in a wild advance, and produce a financial and industrial situation which would be ruinous.

Aside from other considerations and arguments against Government ownership and operation of railroads as a governmental policy, it seems to me that the consideration that I have mentioned would be conclusive against it.

I might mention also that Government ownership as a fixed policy has not been satisfactory, according to the experience of other countries, either to the public served or to the employees. Financially, it has not proven a success, according to my information, except in Germany, where the employees were classed as Government officials or soldiers and received a very low rate of compensation. But I haven't time or space to mention the arguments and considerations to be weighed. I am more than satisfied that Government ownership at this time is a luxury, the purchase of which would ruin us.

Now, since we could not purchase, we had to turn them back, and I have discussed the necessity of financing them. The next question in which you are interested is that in relation to the machinery of the bill for the settlement of disputes between the railroads and their employees.

The principle on which the bill proceeds is to provide for adjustment and conciliation. This is done by providing for the creation of various boards known as railroad boards of labor adjustment, composed of representatives of the employees and the railroads. This is to furnish a place for argument, investigation, and conciliation, and is similar to the machinery provided by the Railroad Administration and employees during the period of Government control and which worked with great success.

There is also provided another board known as the railroad labor board, composed of nine members, three to be selected by the President from not less than six nominated by the employees, three appointed by the President in like manner from like nominees made by the railroad management, and three named by the President representing the public. The theory of this board is that there are three parties in interest to every railroad dispute, namely, the railroad, the men, and the general public. No one will controvert this, I think.

If any board of adjustment, composed of representatives of employees and the railroads, can not settle a dispute among themselves, it may be taken to the railroad labor board; or this board, if the dispute is liable to interrupt commerce and is not promptly decided, may take the matter up and decide it.

The adjustment boards are to decide on questions involving grievances, rules, and working conditions. As far as questions are concerned where the men and the carriers can not agree among themselves as to wages, or where they do agree but it is the opinion of the board that such agreement as to wages must work an advance or readjustment of the rates of the carrier, the labor board has the authority to take the matter up and decide it, and in its decision it is necessary that five out of the nine members shall concur.

In other words, where the public is likely to be affected in its interests by an agreement that will affect the public by an increase in rates, the board wherein the public is represented with the railroads and the men must render the decision. I can see nothing unfair in this. It seems to me right that all parties in interest should have representatives in the court which is to decide the matter.

Now, in passing on the question of wages which will affect rates, we have not left the matter to the whim or standards of the men of the board. It is provided that the board in passing on these questions must take into consideration (1) the scale of wages paid for similar kinds of work in other industries, (2) the relation between wages and cost of living, (3) the hazard of the employment, (4) the training and skill required, (5) the degree of responsibility, (6) the character and regularity of the employment, and (7) the inequalities of increases in wages or of treatment, the result of previous wage orders or adjustment. If wages are fixed according to these standards, do you think that a man will get what his work is reasonably worth?

The idea is that these boards shall hand down opinions, giving the public and the parties involved the benefit of the facts and the judgment of the boards. It was thought to furnish a place for amicable adjustment, where reason and not force should be the decisive factor, relying on public opinion to uphold the decision if it were right, and giving to the public the knowledge of the facts in the case.

There are no antistrike provisions in the bill, nothing to prevent employees from striking, nothing to penalize them if they do. Reliance is placed in confidence in the willingness of employees and railroad officials to do right and justice, and on public opinion to uphold the right when it is decided in the mind of the public by a disclosure of the facts of the case. It is an effort to substitute peace for war, reason for force, in the settlement of disputes. It takes from neither employee nor employer any right that he has heretofore exercised under the law. I do not see how any fair man can object to this effort, at least before trial has shown that it will not produce just results.

A large number of the European countries had antistrike laws in the early part of the last century. In experience they were found not to be satisfactory and practically all have abandoned this method and have sought others. Personally, I have not favored antistrike provisions as contained in the Cummins bill. In the first place, as I was informed, they had not proven satisfactory in other countries, and I had no reason to believe that they would here. I have heard men express fear that a nationwide strike would or might come, and antistrike laws were necessary to prevent it. I do not and can not believe that the railroad men of the country, or any part of them, would produce a nation-wide strike, whatever might be the state of feeling. If this ever comes, it would mean the starvation of the millions of our people and would not be a strike but a revolution, and the people would not be starved, regardless of what they thought of the merits of the dispute that gave rise to it. They would run the roads to get bread, as a matter of self-defense, and the man or men or combination who stood in the way would be swept aside as chaff before the wind never to return. If a condition ever arises where a nation-wide strike is possible or probable, no mere law will stop it. The only law that will be on the statute books that day will be the primal law of struggle to survive.

Now, I have made this letter too long, but could not use less space and present the matters I desired. I have not the time to discuss the other features of the bill. It is a wise measure in many particulars which I can not mention. As I have observed it, a great deal of the opposition to the bill arose out of a desire for permanent Government ownership and operation, and objection would have been made to any bill but this, regardless of its provisions. I do not believe in Government ownership. I am a Democrat and individualist. I believe that it is the function of Government to regulate business when necessary, but not to go into business. We are no more dependent on the railroads than we are on other industries. Why not have the Government go into the packing industry? We are no more dependent on railroads than we are becoming to be on gasoline. Why should the Government not go into the oil business? Government ownership of railroads in other countries has not been a success, and Government operation in this country has not been successful, though it was necessary.

There has not been a question before the Congress since I have been here of more importance, as far as domestic questions are concerned, than this railroad problem. Upon its wise solution depended the prosperity and good of the whole country. There was tremendous pressure from all sides for all sorts of things. Many threats were made by various interests to secure votes for or against it through fear.

It would have been very easy to take to cover and say to oneself: "The bill will pass anyway; I will vote against it and so avoid any criticism from anyone who does not like any of its terms." Some did so for these reasons, as they told me. Others, of course, did not act from such motives in voting against it.

I believed, as did a majority of the House and Senate, that the bill ought to pass; that it was the best bill that we could get; that not to pass one would be disastrous; and if I had run to cover I would have been a traitor to what I believed to be the best interests of my people, and a dirty coward besides.

I know that there have been threats both before and after as to what would be done to me if I did not vote as certain individuals wanted. If I had been scared and had voted through my fears and not through my judgment of what was best, I would not be fit to be here. Personally I do not want a Representative whom I can make do what I tell him, regardless of his judgment of what is right. I do not want one that I own. If I can own him, the other fellow might get him with a bigger price. Neither do I personally want a Representative that I can scare into doing what he thinks is wrong. The other fellow might some day throw a bigger scare into him than I could and he would vote my life away. The man who will be a crook for one will be a crook against him if given the proper inducement.

It will be a sad day for the country when men come to Congress owned by any group. From the nature of the case, the opportunity to know the merits of many public questions is not so good for the body of the citizenship as it is for the man whose business it is to study them and seek all the information he can obtain. As I see it, a man comes to Congress to represent everyone—every person—and to do what is best for them. What is best for all is best for each; the greatest good to the greatest number works out the greatest good to all. If he comes to Congress representing only one class, looking only to a local group, he must necessarily reach wrong conclusions, and winds up not even serving the class that he represents, for what is wrong will not stand and can not produce good even to those in whose behalf the wrong is done. The purpose of government is to preserve to each citizen his just rights, whatever they may be, and the representative in government who proceeds on any other theory will misrepresent and not represent his people.

Now, I must close. Permit me to say that I think that one of the best votes that I have cast for the good of the country, in view of the whole situation, was my vote on this bill; and if I may say something personal, I think that one of the best votes that I have cast for you as a knight of labor was this selfsame vote.

Assuming that this question is to be decided from considerations of immediate self-interest alone, let one ask oneself the question: "What would have become of railroad labor if the roads had been turned back without legislation and had gone, as they would have done, into bankruptcy or receiverships?"

With best wishes, I am,

Your friend,

WEBB VENABLE.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including the address of the Secretary of the Navy to the graduating class at Annapolis the other day. It is worthy of preservation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the legislation of the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of tax legislation in the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

#### THE BUDGET BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to return to the matter that was pending. I suggest that the Members get copies of the budget bill and follow the reading of the amendments which I propose to offer and thereby by unanimous consent modify the bill.

The amendments were read, as follows:

On page 11, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "Supreme Court of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the words "President, with the advice and consent of the Senate," so that it will read: "There shall be in the general accounting office a comptroller general of the United States and an assistant comptroller general of the United States, who shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate."

On page 11, strike out the comma at the end of line 15, and strike out lines 16 to 24, inclusive, and all of line 25, down to and including the word "offices," so that it will read, "The comptroller general and the assistant comptroller general shall hold office during good behavior."

Mr. MONTAGUE. And keep the residue of the section?

Mr. GOOD. The lines that I have referred to are stricken out, but commencing with the word "When," on line 25, the rest of the section remains just as it is in the bill.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, it would read: "That the comptroller general and assistant comptroller general shall hold office during good behavior. When a comptroller general or assistant comptroller general attains the age of 70 years, he shall be retired from office."

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, the gentleman modifies the bill as he proposes?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify the bill as proposed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment submitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "Supreme Court of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the words "President, with the advice and consent of the Senate," and on page 11 strike out the comma at the end of line 15, and strike out lines 16 to 24, inclusive, and all of line 25 down to and including the word "offices."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the gentleman's proposed amendment includes the insertion of a period after the word "behavior" in line 15?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. GARD. Is the language in lines 23, 24, and 25 stricken out?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Down to and including the word "offices"?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for a moment—and I do not intend to object—I want to say that in my opinion you can not have any effective independent audit by Congress when the man to do the auditing for Congress is responsible to the executive branch of the Government and removable by the President, and I think this amendment takes 90 per cent of the merit and virtue out of the budget legislation.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made upon the floor that this bill as presented this morning from the Budget Committee is an affront to the President of the United States. I yield to no man in admiration and respect for the present President of the United States, and I want to say to the House that the Budget Committee in presenting this bill had no idea of putting any affront upon the President of the United States. This bill is to become permanent law. It does not apply to the present Executive alone, but it is expected to apply to future Presidents of the United States whoever they may be, and I have the best of reasons—I say it advisedly—for believing that the President of the United States does not regard the intention of the Budget Committee to place the authority of appointing the comptroller general in the Supreme Court as in any sense a personal reflection upon him or an affront to him, but that, on the contrary, he is considering this matter wholly with reference to its constitutional aspects.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I wish to confirm with emphasis the statement that has just been made by my friend Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee that the President does not, as I am most reliably advised, regard this matter from a personal point of view in any sense whatever, but has only been considering the constitutional question presented in the veto message. It would be most unfair for the House and unfair for the country to believe for a moment that the President is in any manner constrained in the expression of his opinion by any personal bearing that the method of appointment might be conceived to have. This it should really be unnecessary to say.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa relates alone to the comptroller general, who, among other duties, will audit the expenditures to be made by the executive departments, and I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] that when you take from the comptroller general the independence and freedom from control by the departments which it was sought to give him under the bill as originally proposed, you have destroyed, in my judgment, the chief merit and the most important feature of that particular portion of the bill. You have now a system whereby you have six auditors who audit the expenditures of the Government and who are appointed by and responsible to the executive departments. It is not good business, it is not sound policy, to permit the cashier of a bank to audit his own expenses or the books of his bank. [Applause.] Neither is it sound policy to permit the departments of this Government who make the expenditures to audit their own expenditures. Congress makes the appropriations. Congress ought to control the auditing of those expenditures. That is the reason why I have been so earnest in this matter. There has not been a student of this subject, there has not been a writer on the subject of the budget, there was not a witness before the Budget Committee, who has not taken the firm position that you must have an independent congressional audit or you will fail to have a complete

and rounded budget system. [Applause.] Before that committee there appeared such men as ex-President Taft, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Sherley, and other well-known students of the budget system. I simply make this statement in order that it may be made as clear and emphatic as language can express it that in presenting this proposition your committee had no idea of offering any affront to the present President or to any future President of the United States, but we have simply been interested in securing an independent audit of the expenditures made under the appropriations of Congress, which we believe and all students of the budget system believe is necessary if we are to follow the practices of every business concern in the country and adopt a businesslike control of the appropriations made by Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are all interested in budget legislation. We all desire it. I think there is nothing more important in connection with budget legislation than the provision for an independent audit. The Committee on the Budget, in order to have that independent audit entirely uninfluenced by those whose duty it was to audit and check up, provided that the responsible heads of the audit system could only be removed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress or impeachment. The President has felt that that is an infringement of what he insists is his constitutional authority to remove officials. I can not agree with the President in that behalf, but we have tried to pass the bill over the President's veto and failed. I feel that to make the change we are now proposing is a most unfortunate and regrettable weakening of the system we have so earnestly labored to perfect. But, gentlemen, it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us, and it is the duty of a legislative body when it can not do what it considers best to do what it believes is the best thing that it is possible to do under the circumstances, and it is very clear that if we are to have a budget system now—and we ought to have a budget, we are pledged to a budget—we must have it with a provision for the appointment and removal by the President of the officers who are to examine the accounts of the executive departments. I think it is regrettable. I do not believe the Constitution so provides. But at any rate that is the presidential view, and under the circumstances we must meet that view or have no budget legislation. I hope there will be no objection to the unanimous consent. I hope there will be no objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa for the present consideration of the measure.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Since the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa has provided that this officer shall hold his office during good behavior, does not that remove the main objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Possibly so to some extent.

Mr. BLANTON. The President can not remove him unless he misbehaves himself.

Mr. MONDELL. At any rate it is the best we can do now, and I hope we will do it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, several gentlemen have asked me for a little time on this.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Chair to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the present session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. MONDELL and Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

## CORRECTION.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the RECORD. On the 31st of May I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech that the President of the United States made on Memorial Day at Suresnes Cemetery, France, on May 30, 1919. Somehow in the transmission of the speech from France they got one phrase out of whack, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the Secretary to the President may be read, so that it may be straightened out.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, June 2, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: You were good enough on May 31, 1919, to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Memorial Day address which the President delivered at Suresnes Cemetery in France on May 30, 1919. In comparing the address with the original brought from France by the President's stenographer I note that the concluding part of the sixth paragraph reads as follows:

I look for the time when every man who now puts his counsel against the united service of mankind under the League of Nations will be just as ashamed of it as (if he now) regretted the union of the States.

The original report reads as follows:

I look for the time when every man who now puts his counsel against the united service of mankind under the League of Nations will be just as ashamed of it as (if he now) regretted the union of the States.

I wonder if it will not be possible for you to have this error corrected?

I am sending you a copy of the address as delivered, a copy of the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and a copy of the RECORD itself.

Sincerely, yours,

J. P. TUMULTY,  
Secretary to the President.

HOB. CHAMP CLARK,  
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

## MEMBERS TO VISIT PACIFIC COAST.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to visit the Pacific coast as provided in the naval bill the following Members: Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Mr. BRITTON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. PADGETT, and Mr. RIORDAN.

## RIGHTS OF WAY OVER PUBLIC LAND IN CONNECTION WITH IRRIGATION PROJECTS.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 14102) securing rights of way and easements over public land in connection with Federal irrigation projects.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14102) securing rights of way and easements over public land in connection with Federal irrigation projects.

Be it enacted, etc., That where a right of way or easement of any kind, over public land heretofore or hereafter withdrawn under the act of June 17, 1902 (Thirty-second Statutes, page 388), is required in connection with a Federal irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior may cause to be executed and recorded in the office of the recorder of deeds of the county in which the land is located an instrument stating the purpose of the right of way or easement, with a description of the same, in which event entry thereafter made for such land and the patent issued therefor shall be subject to the right of way or easement so described in such recorded instrument.

With the following committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, strike out the comma after the parenthesis.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I want to make an inquiry. Is this bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent?

Mr. KINKAID. It is.

Mr. GARD. May I inquire of the Speaker what will be the legislative course in regard to bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, whether they are to be called on the calendar, or does the Speaker intend to recognize Members individually?

The SPEAKER. The Chair intends to call them on the calendar. The Chair will state that he will recognize a few Members who have bills that are innocuous and agreeable to the whole House. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this bill is asked by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of facilitating the administration of the public land laws. The bill does not provide for a gift or a grant or for the disposition of

anything whatever. It provides for the very reverse of that, in that it provides how the Secretary of the Interior may preserve the right to reserve or retain a right of way or an easement over or in public lands, and exercise that right until title thereto has passed. It is intended to apply to conditions like these: Where public lands have been withdrawn for irrigation purposes and thereby rendered not subject to entry under the public land laws in general, the Secretary of the Interior may, when some one wants to make an entry and it is found proper that such entry should be allowed under the public land laws, the Secretary, in view of the fact that the right of way for a canal or for irrigation purposes or for a roadway or for a reservoir, or some other easement, is likely to be needed, sooner or later, may preserve the right to retain this easement by filing with the recorder of deeds of the county in which the land is, notice that the Government preserves or does not waive such right.

Mr. Speaker, I desire not to consume the valuable time of the House unnecessarily, and I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KINKAID, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## ASSIGNMENT OF FREIGHT CARS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the railroad companies are making assignments of freight cars; and  
Whereas the said railroad companies, or a part of them, are making such assignment in a manner alleged to be discriminatory and prejudicial to the common public welfare; and

Whereas authority for making assignment of cars by said railroad companies is predicated upon an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which order is known as order No. — of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dated April 15, 1920, and entitled "Notice to carriers and shippers," and is in the following words and figures:

"The commission recommends that until experience and careful study demonstrate that other rules will be more effective and beneficial, the uniform rules as contained in the Railroad Administration's cars service section circular CS 31 (revised) be continued in effect, except that rule 8, as contained in said circular, should be amended to read:

"8. Private cars and cars placed for railroad fuel loading in accordance with the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Railroad Commission of Ohio et al. v. H. V. Ry. Co. (12 I. C. C. 398, and Trear v. Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al. (13 I. C. C. 451) will be designated as 'assigned' cars. All other cars will be designated as 'unassigned' cars." Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to inform the House of Representatives upon what authority, if any, said order was issued.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. This is exactly the same resolution which passed the Senate last Saturday. It calls on the Interstate Commerce Commission for information only concerning an order known to the coal world as the "assigned-car order." The assigned-car order was considered by the commission appointed by the President to investigate the bituminous coal business, and they reported adverse to the assigned-car order. Paragraph 12 of section 402 of the transportation act as passed was intended to prohibit the "assigned-car order." This order, issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission, has been, as a great many persons believe, misunderstood or abused by the railroads, and under their interpretation of it consider what is happening. We transport about 500,000,000 tons of coal per year, 170,000,000 tons of which is used for railroad fuel. Everyone agrees that that should not be disturbed. When it comes to the other approximately two-thirds needed to supply our factories and the homes, under the assigned-car order only one-fourth of the needed amount is being mined because of the methods used by many of the railroads under the "assigned-car order." I should state that this resolution is similar to the one called up the other day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], to which objection was made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who withdrew the objection as soon as he understood it. The practical result is this—

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is before the House?

The SPEAKER. It is a request for unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution that has been reported.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has consent been given?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated a moment ago, in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], that the Chair intended to take up the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. The Chair would like to change that and first recognize gentlemen to consider one or two bills under unanimous consent, which, of course, can be objected to at any moment.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea of getting anything except information. I should be very glad to follow whatever the Speaker desires.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I have been here every minute for four days endeavoring to get this very important matter considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been here constantly for four days trying to get consideration of a resolution that concerns everybody in the United States who consumes coal. One hundred and ten Members of this body petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission to rescind this assigned-car order. I presented that petition myself.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point for a moment?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not withdraw but withhold the point of order of no quorum. I have been here for one year, and I have not in that time taken one hour of the time of this House in speaking or making points of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the consideration of the resolution. I do not want to object to it, but I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. This resolution is in the same terms as the one passed by the Senate the other day?

Mr. FOSTER. Identically.

Mr. GARD. My information is that that information has been furnished under that resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. My understanding is that it has not yet been furnished. While from a legislative standpoint it is not required that this resolution should be passed here, yet from the standpoint of thousands of miners who are out of work and leaving for other fields, from the standpoint of everyone in the United States who consumes coal, both factories and homes, I think we should consider it now. You will be paying far more than \$15 a ton for coal next winter and will hardly be able to get it at that. It is not a matter of wages alone, but concerns a real necessity of life.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to state that they are taking practically all of the cars from the outlying sections under the present car-service act and putting them in the congested centers. Does this authorize them to take still more cars from the outlying sections? For the past seven or eight months in the section of the country which I happen to represent there have been thousands and thousands of bushels of wheat on the ground, a great deal of it rotting, because we could not get cars to move it. If you are going to give them further authority to take what few cars we have in that section and send them to other sections, it seems to me that it would be disastrous.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not interfere with you at all. I have been importuning the Interstate Commerce Commission for over six weeks upon this subject. We had up the Texas situation. It is only open-top cars in control of the railroads that we need.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The resolution does not limit the operations to the open cars. If it did that, I would have no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. We practically use nothing else in our whole coal territory.

Mr. JONES of Texas. But the resolution is general in its operation.

Mr. FOSTER. It merely calls for information as to the reasons of the Interstate Commerce Commission for this one order covering the assigned-car proposition. If they report to us that the order is not contrary to the provisions of the transportation act, then in the next session of Congress we can further legislate upon the proposition.

Mr. JONES of Texas. But in the meantime they might get all of the cars out of the sections of the agricultural country.

Mr. FOSTER. The practical workings will not hurt the gentleman at all, because the trouble in the coal-mining sections is

shown when I tell you that I can stand at one home in my county and see one mine running 11 days out of 12, and beside it four others run only 1 day out of 12. The trouble is between the mines themselves; it is the improper distribution of the cars in the mining section when they get them there; and the miners in these four or five mines that run only one day in every two weeks are leaving, because they can not make enough to live. It is not so much to get the coal cars there, but to get a just distribution of the cars that we have, so that the mines can work more uniformly.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Why does not the resolution limit its terms to that?

Mr. FOSTER. It refers to the one order issued, and it has no direct reference to the Texas situation.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object—

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. If the gentleman does not intend to object the regular order is demanded.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I reserved the right to object for the purpose of asking if this resolution is not merely a resolution of inquiry, and hence could not do the damage suggested?

Mr. FOSTER. That is absolutely true.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. It is for the purpose, as I understand it, of calling the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the fact that the House of Representatives does not construe the assigned-car provision as the Interstate Commerce Commission has construed it.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I think the resolution ought to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. That position is taken, I might say—I trust with no impropriety—by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. Esch] and by the ranking member, as I have been advised, of the Senate committee concerning this matter.

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman that the other day I was down to see the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning the proposed order to allocate the open-top cars to coal producers. Here is what they told me, that in view of the fact that large contractors and municipalities and counties throughout the United States were building roads and depending upon some cars to haul the road material, that they had refused to allocate all of the open-top cars to coal miners, but if it became necessary they would in the future allocate all open-top cars for coal. Now, you do not want to do an injustice here by a resolution and cause them to make this order before the people who are building roads have an opportunity to get their materials.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not trying to do that. If the gentleman will get this in mind I think he will understand the condition. I can stand in my county, as I stated awhile ago, and see five mines, one working 11 days out of 12 and the other four working 1 day out of 12. The trouble is of allocating the cars under this order. Some railroads are endeavoring to buy cheap coal with the empty cars they have there. In my district now railroads get coal at \$3.20 per ton, and you can not go with the cash and buy a ton for less than \$5.75. It has gone up rapidly in the last three weeks, and where it will be next winter we do not know, and I think we ought to have this information from the Interstate Commerce Commission, that we may have their construction as to what paragraph 12 of section 402 of the transportation act means, and then we can correct it at the next session of Congress, if necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. At this very time the public utilities of Michigan have been closing down for lack of fuel. The situation could not be more serious than it is now. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question. The information has come to me that one of the reasons why these cars are going into the congested centers, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas, is that they are being used for hoarding and storage of food and other necessities of life. Will the gentleman, if he has any influence with the commission, and I know he has, see that that is investigated?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to travel under false pretenses, and I would not pretend to have power to influence the Interstate Commerce Commission on that matter.

Mr. KING. I know these box cars are being used for the purpose of hoarding food and that people are starving to death.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I think there will be no trouble if the resolution is understood, and I ask that the resolution be again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that the resolution be again reported.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. I recognize the trouble arising from the shortage of cars. It seems to me perchance we had better leave the Interstate Commerce Commission alone so far as resolutions are concerned. I live in a county that is one of the greatest coal-producing counties in Illinois, 120 miles south of Chicago, and it is the best agricultural section of central Illinois—in the Union, perhaps—excepting none. Now, I get wires and letters from there saying they are constructing roads begun before the war, and bonds by the millions have been issued to contractors and taken up, almost all of them. The whole thing has halted now. The cars that haul coal into Chicago and near-by places—and that is the second great manufacturing city of the country—must run back empty or loaded. Now, the cement, the gravel, the sand are going back loaded that way, and there is a good deal of kicking, you know, because I get the kick in large part from Illinois; and I have been informed and believe that while coal is a great thing, still it is some little time until winter, and you can not build roads in the wintertime, so that, after all, coal is not the only thing that gives a Member of Congress trouble who represents such a constituency. I do not want to object, but I want to say what I have said, because if the Interstate Commerce Commission is to be influenced by any action we can take as the House of Representatives, I want to put in my few words; so that, taking into consideration not only the coal, taking into consideration the good roads, and also taking into consideration all other conditions, we had better let the Interstate Commerce Commission alone. [Applause.] I do not oppose the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to call attention to the fact, in connection with this resolution, that the coal situation is not the only one that is suffering by reason of the lack of cars.

Mr. FOSTER. I fully realize that.

Mr. HOWARD. All over this country workmen are being thrown out of work, road improvements are being held up, and contractors are losing money. Now, less than three months ago we passed the railroad measure which its friends claimed would be a constructive one. One of the arguments in favor of that measure was that it left the car service in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that here, three months afterwards, before the Interstate Commerce Commission has worked this situation out and worked it out fairly for all interests, that we at the closing hours of this Congress should interfere with the working of that commission before they have yet laid their lines and got their plans in working order. And I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

#### ANARCHISTIC ALIENS AND SIMILAR CLASSES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 11224, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up from the Speaker's table and moves to concur in the Senate amendments to a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 11224) to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. There is no "right to object." It is in order.

Mr. KING. The gentleman from Washington asked unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. But it was not necessary.

Mr. KING. I would like to have an explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will undoubtedly explain it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the Members of the House—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. This is a very important bill, with many amendments, which it is absolutely impossible for us to understand at this date in the procedure, and I am not willing that this bill be taken up. I will be compelled to make a point of no quorum if the gentleman insists on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman withhold his objection until I can make a brief statement?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not want any debate on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. These amendments modify this bill as it passed the House on December 20.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We have no opportunity for debate on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It makes specific the classes of aliens that shall not come to the United States and who shall be deported if here, and will help solve the trouble that has distressed the United States.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have no question but that is the gentleman's view of the bill, and he may be correct. However, the balance of us have had no opportunity to reach any such conclusion. I am not willing to have discussion on the bill at all. I shall make the point of order that there is no quorum.

Mr. RAKER. I ask the gentleman from Washington not to withdraw the bill. I will make the point if the gentleman does.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

The Speaker proceeded to count.

Mr. RAKER. Before the Speaker gets through counting, will the gentleman from Alabama yield that I may say one word to him?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can converse with him. [Laughter.] No debate is in order. The gentleman can speak to him, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request made by me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman do it except by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. Certainly. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] withdraw the point of no quorum if the gentleman from Washington withdraws the bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Washington withdraw the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I withdraw the bill.

Mr. RAKER. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. There is an objection made to this bill on the ground of its consideration, and because there is no quorum present—

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. RAKER. The point of order is, that there is no quorum.

The SPEAKER. That is not any point.

Mr. RAKER. I made the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must make the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. The point of order is there is no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, on an assurance of the gentleman from Washington that he will bring it in later in the day, I withdraw the point of order temporarily.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the legislation of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the legislation of the session. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on two subjects. One is Senate joint resolution 191, that failed of passage night before last, and one on investigations in the Quartermaster's Department.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subjects indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the legislation of the present Congress, especially that affecting the Middle West.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of legislation of the present Congress, especially that affecting the Middle West. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made last night on the merchant-marine bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks made last night on the merchant marine bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the budget bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of the budget bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the work in Congress and insert two or three small letters personal to myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert two or three small letters personal to himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the same request.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to the insertion of outside documents of a purely personal and political nature.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan objects to the insertion of the letters. Is there objection to the request for the extension, leaving the letters out?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request with respect to extending my remarks on the legislation of the present Congress, especially on the subject of inland waterways.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the appropriations of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks concerning the appropriations of this Congress. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the same privilege, to extend my remarks on the general legislation of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the same request. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suppose it is understood that that agreement, the practical agreement here, about these extensions, that they are not to include discussion of the bonus, is still in effect, and that these requests that cover matters of legislation are exclusive of the bonus proposition?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know of any such agreement that prevents a Member from including a reference to the bonus along with other legislation. It would be ridiculous to have such an agreement. It is an important item. I do not know of anyone who can exercise censorship as to a particular item of legislation.

Mr. GARRETT. I will not attempt to exercise any censorship, but I shall exercise the right of objecting to extensions of remarks on the subject of the bonus.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman can object to all matters of legislation if he will, but I object to this conspiracy of silence with respect to the discussion of the bonus.

Mr. GARRETT. Some of us objected very much to being compelled to pass it without opportunity of debate. It is a farce to pass a bill like that in 10 minutes and then fill up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with speeches and give the impression to the country that the bill was fully discussed in the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to extend my remarks on that piece of legislation, but it is ridiculous here for Members to extend on everything else and then to say that you can not extend on that particular subject.

Mr. GARRETT. I object to any extension of remarks on the subject of the bonus.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], provided discussion of the bonus is not included?

Mr. CROWTHER. I have said already all that I have to say on the subject of the bonus, and everybody knows where I stand on that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the water-power legislation, and also on bills and legislation reported from the Committee on the Public Lands of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on water-power legislation and also on legislation coming from the Public Lands Committee of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on national highways and our undeveloped resources.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on national highways and our undeveloped resources. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of general legislation, without any reference to the bonus.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of general legislation, without any reference to the bonus. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of general legislation, without reference to the bonus. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINIRY. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague, Mr. O'CONNELL, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York, in behalf of his colleague, Mr. O'CONNELL, makes the same request, without reference to the bonus. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I object as to that restriction about the bonus. That is all intended to throw discredit on that legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of public highways and the road-aid bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of public highways and the road-aid bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] about the shutting out of speeches about this bonus. We tried every way in the world that we knew how to get that bill up so that we could amend it and debate it, and we could not get opportunity to debate it. We were compelled to pass that thing under suspension of the rules, with 40 minutes' debate. Now, I am opposed to lugging in speeches here about it and flooding the country with them. Your vote shows just as well how you stood as all the speeches you could make between now and next Christmas.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is not that equally true as to other legislative matters?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; because almost every man in the House is printing speeches about it. The first man who started this objection about including remarks on the bonus

in extensions of remarks was a distinguished Republican, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. CRAMTON. But all the objections have come from those who opposed the bonus, and they insist that this is the one particular measure that shall not be discussed. The extensions appear in the Record for what they are. Everyone familiar with the Record knows they were not delivered on the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not one man in America out of ten that knows anything about this Record.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Member who favored the bonus, and who has no excuses to offer and no desire to print any speech on that or any other subject, I protest against this continued policy of attempting to cast discredit on that measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nobody is casting discredit on it.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the effect of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no. I voted for it.

Mr. CRAMTON. If we are going to have extensions on the budget, if we are going to have extensions on appropriations and everything else, we will have extensions on the bonus if anybody wants to extend.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not as long as people have the power of objecting.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a mutual power of objecting.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Every Member has an equal right, and it will be exercised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not start it.

Mr. CRAMTON. We can finish it, though.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On June 4, 1920:

H. R. 1024. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo.;

H. R. 2396. An act for the relief of John A. Gauley;

H. R. 3212. An act for the relief of legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased;

H. R. 9392. An act regulating the disposition of lands formerly embraced in the grants to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and Coos Bay Wagon Road Co.;

H. R. 9583. An act for the relief of Edward A. Purdy, postmaster of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., for postage stamps, postal-savings stamps, war-savings stamps, war-tax revenue stamps, and cash from money orders stolen from the branch post office at Minneapolis, Minn., commonly known and described as the traffic station and located at Nos. 621 and 623 First Avenue North, in said city;

H. R. 10115. An act for the relief of Harvey R. Butcher;

H. R. 13108. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13416. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12775. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice.

On June 5, 1920:

H. R. 13266. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13870. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purpose;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the American Legion Post No. 73, Vincennes, Ind., necessary cots for use at the State encampment of the American Legion to be held at Vincennes, Ind., on June 28 and 29, 1920;

H. J. Res. 336. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Albert Sidney Johnston Camp, United Confederate Veterans, No. 1820, Fort Worth, Tex., 100 tents and cots for the use of Confederate Veterans at the reunion of said camp June 24 to 27, inclusive, 1920;

H. R. 1309. An act for the relief of Perry L. Haynes;

H. R. 1827. An act for the relief of Carolyn Wheeler Kobbe;

H. R. 6198. An act authorizing payment of compensation to Swanbild Sims for personal injuries;

H. R. 9048. An act for the relief of Catherina Rea, administratrix of the estate of John Rae;

H. R. 6222. An act to remove a certain tract or lots of land in Cristobal, Canal Zone, from the operation and effect of the Executive order of the President of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the act of Congress of August 24, 1912 (37 Stats., ch. 390, p. 565); and

H. R. 11030. An act for the relief of the Woodford Bank & Trust Co., of Versailles, Ky.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that June 4 they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 14208. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended;

H. R. 13266. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12530. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 13229. An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13627. An act to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines";

H. R. 10806. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved shore spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska;

H. R. 14335. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired;

H. R. 14338. An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis;

H. R. 10378. An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10011. An act authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather;

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument marking the starting point of the motor convoy from Washington to San Francisco;

H. R. 13962. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 10183. An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6407. An act for the relief of Michael MacGarvey.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1222. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*;

S. 3852. An act for the relief of the Garden City (Kans.) Water Users' Association, and for other purposes;

S. 3270. An act authorizing the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damages occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases;

S. 4167. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri;

S. 4435. An act to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America;

S. 1005. An act for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoua*; and

S. 3244. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to R. I. Credille, mayor of the village of Bonita, La., in trust, for certain purposes.

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9281) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and to disagree to the Senate amendments to and ask for a conference on a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request as to H. R. 7775, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a bill which will be reported by the Clerk, and to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CANNON. Are these individual pension bills?

Mr. SELLS. Omnibus private bills.

Mr. CANNON. No general legislation in either one of them?

Mr. SELLS. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD.

Mr. SELLS. I make the same request as to H. R. 10515, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the same request as to H. R. 10515, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD.

Mr. SELLS. I make the same request as to H. R. 11554, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes a similar request as to a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a conference?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SELLS, Mr. KIESS, and Mr. MEAD.

#### REQUESTS TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the soldier in the World War.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the soldier in the World War. Is there objection?

Mr. FLOOD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the legislation of the present Congress—not with reference to the bonus.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the legislation of the present Congress, not with reference to the bonus. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I object, unless the gentleman withdraws that reference to the bonus.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. BURROUGHS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the merchant marine bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the merchant marine. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the Mason resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the Mason resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the merchant marine bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the merchant marine bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of coal and the transportation systems.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of coal and the transportation systems. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENSON. Reserving the right to object, I do not like to object to anything, but I saw a statement coming from Senator Smoot, chairman of the Committee on Printing, in which he stated that they had had to stop the sending of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to subscribers, that there was a limitation on the amount of paper that could be used in printing these speeches, and it seems to me it is about time for somebody to object to this matter, and therefore I think I will start it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will withhold that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman withdraw that?

Mr. STEVENSON. I withdraw it for the present, although it looks as though we would have to bring in a general statute on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of measures which I have supported in Congress.

Mr. LITTLE. Did you support the bonus?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes; I did.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of legislation which he supported in Congress. Is there objection?

Mr. ASWELL. I will not discuss the bonus.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of "Weighed in the balance and found wanting."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is the gentleman reflecting on Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; on the Democratic inefficiency for the past eight years. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the red influence on legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the red influence on legislation. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. I object.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Bergdoll resolution to investigate the escape of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to extend his remarks in the Record on the Bergdoll resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. CURRIE, may extend his remarks in the RECORD on general legislation and economic conditions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. CURRIE, may extend his remarks on general legislation and economic conditions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on personal credit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Several Members objected.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the soldier in the World War, and it has no reference to the report of the subcommittee or the committee on investigation, and there is no bonus in it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the soldier of the World War. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bituminous coal supply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on general legislation, excluding the bonus.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on Americanism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by a short reference to a draft officer who lost his life in the service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the condition of the country generally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the condition of the country generally. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to extend remarks in the RECORD on the extension of remarks?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not wish to do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Federal reserve act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Federal reserve act. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address that I made a few weeks ago in the conference room of the House Office Building on the subject of making hats.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the vocational rehabilitation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the sugar situation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the sugar situation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on general legislation with the exception of the bonus. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the House let me make a suggestion? I do not know whether it will be agreed to or not. It seems that a large proportion of the membership is making this request. If some gentleman will make a request that Members may have permission to extend remarks in the RECORD for three or five days upon matters other than the legislation that some of us object to, I think this matter could be settled more quickly and with less confusion. It has reached a point where we can hardly hear what is going on.

Mr. FLOOD. What is the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. GARRETT. That some one ask unanimous consent that Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on subjects excluding the bonus legislation.

Mr. FLOOD. I shall object to that.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech of my colleague, Mr. SIEGEL, delivered at New Haven, on the subject of, What Ails America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
Washington, June 5, 1920.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day transmitted to the governor of the State of New York my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the twenty-sixth New York district, to take effect at the close of the day on Monday, June 7.

Yours, very respectfully,

EDMUND PLATT.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to bills of the following titles, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conferences asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. KING as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

H. R. 9281. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 10515. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 11554. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 7775. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution to create a joint committee on the reorganization of the administrative branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1353. An act for the relief of the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2934. An act for the relief of the Leavenworth Bridge Co., of Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3998. An act authorizing any tribes or bands of Indians of California to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2707. An act for the relief of Ellen M. Willey, widow of Owen S. Willey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### EXCLUSION OF ALIEN ANARCHISTS, ETC.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11224) to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes,"

approved October 16, 1918, with Senate amendments thereto, and move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PERSONAL ADDRESS.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to lose the splendid services of the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. PLATT, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may address the House for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me to say, I think, that it is with a great deal of regret that I send in my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives, even to accept such an office as membership on the Federal Reserve Board. I received the notification of the signing of my commission only this morning, and, of course, until such notification had been received, it would hardly have been in order to send in my resignation.

I have greatly enjoyed my services in the House of Representatives and the companionship here. I feel certain that for some weeks after I get into my new office I shall be a rather lonesome individual, though there will be plenty of work and responsibility. It will perhaps help some to realize that Congress is not in session. If it were in session I think I should find myself wandering back here occasionally to take lunch with my friends or talk with them, as I have been accustomed to doing.

Before I leave the House I desire to say that it is my opinion that the responsibility of the House Banking and Currency Committee and of the House itself will perhaps be as great during the next few years as the responsibility of the Federal Reserve Board itself. Those of you who have read the financial history of the United States following the Civil War know what a flood of wild and dangerous ideas came into Congress, backed by considerable numbers of people. Propositions were made to repudiate the public debt, to issue unlimited quantities of greenbacks, to pay the debt in greenbacks, and so forth, and the agitation kept on until finally it died out with the resumption of specie payments and was then revived again in another way through the free-silver agitation. That agitation, I think, started because of high prices and high taxes, but increased greatly during the period of falling prices following the war. We have not had falling prices yet to any extent and everyone is complaining because of the high cost of living and apparently wanting falling prices. When the falling prices come, then the howl will be 10 times greater than it has been over the high cost of living. That always has been so in the past and it will be so again unless history fails to repeat itself. Men will be needed in Congress who understand the situation and who have the courage to stand by their convictions in order to hold back the agitation that is likely to come. Of course, it will take a different form, because we have financed this war in a much better way than the Civil War was financed. We have no great flood of greenbacks. The greenbacks still left from the Civil War are a mere drop in the bucket. In their place we have Federal reserve notes, which are issued in very large volume, but they are issued not by the Government but by or through the banks with ample security. Some people call it inflation and I think a good deal of it fairly may be called inflation, because a large part of the volume of Federal reserve notes is due to the rediscounting of notes based on Government bonds or war paper and not on commercial paper. In order to help float those bonds, as you know, the Federal reserve banks placed lower rediscount rates on notes based on bonds than on commercial paper, a thing utterly contrary to all good, sensible banking practice.

Commercial paper and agricultural paper—paper of people producing—ought to bear a lower rate always than paper based on any kind of stock or bond collateral, even Government bonds. As I have said, the lower rediscount rate on war paper was necessary, and it was impossible to raise that rate very much immediately after the war was over, because many people had bought Liberty bonds beyond their means and out of motives of patriotism, borrowing money to buy them. To force them to sell would, of course, have been a greater hardship. There were

many cases doubtless where people have paid other debts bearing a higher rate of interest or where they have used money in speculation, instead of paying for their Liberty bonds. That is known to have been so in a great many instances, and that is one of the reasons why the rate has been raised somewhat on Liberty bonds recently. It is hoped that people who still owe money on Liberty bonds will pay for them as soon as possible, so that war paper can be taken out of the banks and so that the funds now tied up in loans on war paper can be loaned for commercial purposes. Inflation should decrease automatically as payments are made on notes secured by bonds.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to enter into any controversy with the gentleman from New York, but I rise for the purpose of stating what I believe is in the heart and mind of every individual, not only the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but the Members generally of the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] has always been most courteous and considerate as chairman of that committee. His information is wide and his thought is clear upon all these questions, and he has been of great advantage to every member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am glad to be able to state that I have had the honor and pleasure of sitting on that committee under the tutelage of the eminent gentleman from New York. I believe I express the thought of every other Member of this House when I say that we wish him Godspeed and success in every undertaking. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I did not know I was yielding for a complimentary speech. I have only to say again that I shall regret very much indeed to leave the House. It is a great legislative body and the experience of service here is invaluable. We need not take too seriously the criticisms of Congress, for its Members are actuated by patriotism and a desire to serve the interests of the whole country, even though the complex interests of different districts may make it seem otherwise on rare occasions. The member who is willing to work finds an overwhelming amount of work to do, and benefits himself as well as his country by doing as much of it as possible as well as he can. The training one receives on many of the committees is invaluable, and the Committee on Banking and Currency is one of them—one of the greatest. I think of Congress sometimes as a great university, and of the Committee on Banking and Currency as one of its great departments. I enjoyed the great advantage of serving on that committee under Mr. CARTER GLASS, afterwards Secretary of the Treasury, and now Senator from Virginia, and also of the discussions of the Federal reserve act and the farm-loan act, and of having served on conference committees on the Federal reserve act and the Federal farm-loan act before I became the chairman. It was wonderful training, but I shall nevertheless enter upon my new duties on the Federal Reserve Board with some misgiving and with the consciousness that there is much to learn.

I expect and hope when Congress comes back I shall be able to come over here occasionally, and I am sure there is no privilege I shall value more highly than that accorded to a former Member of coming on the floor of the House. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess for two hours.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment? I would like to have five minutes in which to address the House.

Mr. CANNON. There is liable to be a point of no quorum raised.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes. Well, after all is said and done, I believe that we would get along better and would not be as hungry as we are now and might rest up a bit by taking such a recess.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I simply wished to follow the proprieties on an occasion of this kind, but if it is offensive to the gentleman I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas to address the House for five minutes?

Mr. CANNON. On what subject?

The SPEAKER. On the subject of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], the Chair supposes.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, while it was a matter of genuine regret to me, as I stated at the time I submitted the request of the gentlemen from New York to address the House, that he was retiring from our midst, and that we were to lose not only the pleasure of his association but his splendid services as one of the hard-working, practical Members of this House, yet it is a pleasure to me to call attention, and that is my object in a few short words, to what constitutes a record of which the gentleman may well be proud, and of which I am sure he is proud. Whatever may be his splendid services in the position to which he is going, and I am sure he will render splendid service there, he will not have the opportunity, although he will have both the capacity and the desire, to render the same earnest, sincere service to the country that he has in his quiet, yet forceful and unobtrusive way, rendered as a Member of this House. [Applause.] My short membership in this House has convinced me that it would be of interest to the public and would benefit the public service if the President of the United States would more often come to the House of Representatives in making his selections for men for important governmental positions. [Applause.] We all remember the predecessor of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT], our very beloved CARTER GLASS, who won his spurs upon the floor of this House. It was the hard work and splendid service that he rendered here that was the bedrock, the training and groundwork for the splendid service that he rendered as Secretary of the Treasury and attracted to his high character and his splendid ability the favorable attention of the country, so that to-day CARTER GLASS has the confidence, respect, and affection of even his political opponents, and is universally regarded as one of the great outstanding, towering figures in American public life. [Applause.] The gentleman from New York will carry to the Federal Reserve System an experience that is so necessary during the next 5 or 10 years of that great system. He and I have frequently differed, and I have not the slightest doubt that we shall differ in the future, but I shall close what I have to say with this: That whatever differences I and even some of his own party associates may have with him in our consideration of public business, we shall always have for him that tender affection, that high regard that his character commands, and the great respect for his splendid ability which has been demonstrated by his service in the committee room and upon this floor. [Applause.]

#### EMBASSY BUILDINGS, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill S. 3406.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3406) for the purchase of the buildings and grounds for an embassy of the United States at Brussels, Belgium.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 14444.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14444) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River connecting Wilbarger County, Tex., and Tillman County, Okla., beginning at a point in the Mrs. Eliza Littleton survey, Wilbarger County, Tex., and extending north to a point near the line between range 21 and range 22 west, township 2 south, Jackson County, Okla.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Vernon Bridge Co., a corporation, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation connecting Wilbarger County, Tex., and Tillman County, Okla., beginning at a point in the Mrs. Eliza Littleton survey, Wilbarger County, Tex., and extending north to a point near the line between ranges 21 and 22 west, township 2 south, Jackson County, Okla., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PARRISH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### SURVEY OF WABASH RIVER IN ILLINOIS AND INDIANA.

Mr. LUHRING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 13573.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13573) to make a preliminary survey of the Wabash River in Illinois and Indiana with a view to the control of its floods.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a preliminary survey to be made of the Wabash River in Illinois and Indiana with a view to the control of its floods, in accordance with provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LUHRING. Will the gentleman withhold his objection until I can make a short statement?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold it.

Mr. LUHRING. Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply a preliminary step made necessary by the flood-control act. It carries no appropriation. If a survey is ordered it can be made with no expense to the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. It will not cost the Government anything?

Mr. LUHRING. No, sir, according to the testimony of Col. Taylor, the engineer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, this bill will not cost the Federal Government a cent. There is a very serious flood situation there and they are anxious to conjure up some scheme by which those floods can be controlled. We wanted to know how much it would cost to make the survey. The department down here are able to give us that information, and all this bill calls for is a report, and they could ascertain how much it would cost to make a detailed survey.

This preliminary examination will not cost a cent. Fifty thousand acres of very valuable farm lands there have been overflowed so frequently this year that they can not make a crop on them. The farmers there are very much interested in it, and the whole country is interested in it. As I say, it will not cost a cent.

Mr. BARKLEY. My reservation of objection is based upon not that it is going to cost anything, but to the fact that below the mouth of the Wabash River there is a widespread fear on the part of the farmers, on both sides of the river, that this project will result in the overflow of their land.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is why they want the survey. It does not authorize any work to be done. It authorizes the engineers to find out how much it would cost to make this survey, to ascertain how these floods can be controlled without injuring anybody. Those people that the gentleman talks of came before the committee and said that the activities heretofore, here and there and yonder, without any coordination, without any plan for the control of the floods as a whole, were injuring their lands, and they would like, if possible, to conjure up a scheme where all could be protected without injury to anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is the gentleman from Mississippi willing to state that if there is any reasonable ground to believe that, if the project or survey is made or reported back, the committee having charge of this legislation would not favor any such project as would injure farms below the mouth of the Wabash River, if this objection is withdrawn?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, the engineers are simply requested to tell us what it will cost to make the survey. If the committee authorizes the survey to be made, then, of course, it would be time to make this objection. But the gentleman's constituents and my constituents have been protected by the flood-control act.

Mr. BLANTON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana if this is a sequence of the bill which he introduced seeking to drain the farm lands of the Wabash Valley over there?

Mr. LUHRING. It is practically a substitute for it, a new bill providing for the survey of the entire valley, so as to protect all interests. For instance, there are three projects now in process—

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman say that the survey of the whole Wabash Valley will not cost anything?

Mr. LUHRING. This is a preliminary survey.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It will not cost a cent.

Mr. BLANTON. Every time I have had one made it has cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to desist a minute so that I may get information, because my people are seriously interested in this. If I am not convinced that this will not be a danger to the Ohio River down

there, I am going to object, because there is a great protest against the bill which the gentleman introduced on the question of draining the Wabash River bottoms, because the people on the lowland of the Ohio River, on both sides, are very apprehensive that with that drainage the excess water will come over and flood them.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is exactly why we want the survey, so as to see if a scheme can be conjured up so that the country can be protected from overflow; and the engineers can furnish an estimate of what that survey will cost, if this bill passes, without any expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman is informed on this proposition, and I want to ask for information. Why is this purported survey confined to the Wabash River instead of the Ohio, which is immediately adjacent and below?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. This relates simply to the owners on the Wabash River, and we have one that relates to the Mississippi and another to the Sacramento. The gentleman knows we were pilloried here when we put many river and harbor projects in one bill, and it was called "pork." So we report one at a time. It will not cost anything. It absolutely gives information of what a survey would cost if that survey is ordered to find out if the floods can be controlled without injury to anybody.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am not so much interested in the cost of the proposition as I am in the effect which it will have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why does not the committee bring in a proposition to make a general survey of the Ohio and its tributaries, because you have got to make a survey of the Ohio in order to make an intelligent report on the Wabash?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Because the engineers said it would cost \$10,000,000 to do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman that we will have two or three hours here yet. For the time being I will object.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman ought not to object.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am not talking about the cost. What I am talking about is the effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. For the present I object, Mr. Speaker.

#### THE PATENT OFFICE.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11984, the Patent Office bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11984, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object in order to save time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3 o'clock.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me suggest that there is no possibility of these measures that the gentlemen are calling up now passing the Senate and becoming laws. We know that. We were here until an early hour this morning, somewhere between 1 and 2 o'clock. This side, upon whom responsibility does not rest directly, furnished the majority of those who were here last night. There is a sincere desire here to take that recess until about 3 o'clock. It is usual to do it. There is no chance of these belated measures becoming laws. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. MORGAN. I will state to the gentleman that for nearly a week I have been trying to get opportunity to make an address on a subject of considerable importance, and I want only 5 or 10 minutes' time.

Mr. BLANTON. There are others who want time.

Mr. GARRETT. Very well. At the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes the House recess until 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes the House recess until 3 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for seven minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture appropriation bill which recently passed the House and Senate contains the following important provision:

There is hereby constituted a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to consist of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses, and two other members of each of said committees, to be designated by the chairmen of the respective committees, and it shall be the duty of said joint committee to investigate and report at as early a date as may be possible as to the practicability of establishing a system of short-time rural credits in the United States and to recommend such legislation as may be deemed practicable and desirable to that end.

The creation of this joint committee is in my judgment a matter of very great importance. Members of the House will recall the fact that in 1912 the two great political parties of the Nation placed in their platforms declarations in favor of providing agriculture with better credit facilities. The subject was considered for several years in Congress. As a result, the Federal farm-loan act was enacted. It was approved on the 17th day of July, 1916. This act relates only to long-time farm-mortgage credit. Under it loans can not be obtained for less than 5 years nor for more than 40 years. I was greatly interested in all this legislation. I contributed in every way in my power to secure its enactment. It is the universal opinion that this system of long-time farm credit has vindicated itself. As time goes on it will become more and more appreciated. But Congress completed only half of its task. We should have a special system of short-term or personal farm credit for the benefit of the farmers of this country.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I will be delighted to yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. STEVENSON. How is that committee constituted—the committee that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. MORGAN. The joint committee referred to consists of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, and in addition thereto each of these four chairmen appoint two other members selected from their respective committees, making three members from each of the above committees, and the entire membership of the joint committee consists of 12 persons.

Mr. STEVENSON. Unless action is taken to select a chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House—

Mr. RAKER. That has already been done.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from South Carolina refers to the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT]. This vacancy was filled this afternoon, when the House, on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], elected the able and distinguished Member from Pennsylvania, the Hon. LOUIS T. McFADDEN, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a banker and also represents one of the greatest agricultural districts of Pennsylvania, I feel sure that the subject of short-term or personal farm credit will be given wise and favorable consideration. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and I feel sure that he will do his part well.

Mr. STEVENSON. I will say to the gentleman that anything possible to be done within the region of safe banking should be done.

Mr. MORGAN. I heartily agree with my friend. There could hardly be a greater calamity come to agriculture than to create a new system of short-term or personal credit for farmers that would not be safe and sound. My reading and investigation of the subject have led me to the conclusion that the soundness of any system of credit is of paramount importance. In establishing a new system of short-term credit for our farmers we must see to it that the system we establish shall be safe, sound, and permanent. It is only such a system that will give our farmers the credit and the service to which they are justly entitled. I wish now to give an outline of the plan proposed in my bill, H. R. 14367.

#### A PLAN PROPOSED.

On the 18th day of January, 1918, during the Sixty-fifth Congress, I introduced in the House H. R. 8827, entitled "A bill

to provide short-term credit for the farmers of the United States, and for other purposes." On the 24th day of January, 1918, I delivered a speech in the House of Representatives explaining the provisions of the said bill and urging Congress to establish a system of personal or short-term farm credit to promote the agricultural interests of the Nation. With some modifications I have reintroduced this bill in this, the Sixty-sixth Congress. It is H. R. 14367, with the same title as the original bill. The bill in full will be printed as part of my remarks as Appendix A.

#### OUTLINE OF PLAN.

The bill proposes—

- (1) To authorize farmers to incorporate local credit organizations under the name of "Federal farm credit societies."
- (2) To establish 12 regional banks to be known as "national farm credit banks."
- (3) To require the Federal reserve banks to rediscount, under proper restrictions, the notes of farmers when indorsed by a local credit society and a regional bank, and to authorize all other banks to discount or rediscount such papers.
- (4) To make the regional banks Government depositaries, and to authorize special deposits therein by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be used in extending credit to farmers of the United States.
- (5) To authorize regional banks to issue and sell farm-credit debentures based upon the notes of farmers when indorsed by a local Federal farm credit society and a regional bank.

#### NATIONAL FARM-CREDIT BANKS.

Under the provisions of my bill, the 12 regional banks are designated as "national farm-credit banks." The following summary describes their chief characteristics:

1. One of these banks will be located in each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts, and the national farm-credit bank and the Federal land bank in each of said districts will be twin institutions, located in the same city, doing business in the same building, having the same men for directors and officers, assistants, and employees, and yet be entirely separate and independent corporations, promoting a different line of agricultural credit, and in no way responsible for each other's contracts or debts.
2. Exclusive of the capital subscribed by Federal farm-credit societies, which must be equal to one-tenth of the amount of credit extended to such societies, every national farm-credit bank, before beginning business, must have a minimum capital of \$2,000,000, which, if not otherwise subscribed, will be taken by the Federal Government.
3. They may receive deposits, pay interest thereon, borrow money, use their funds in making loans to Federal farm-credit societies, and by discounting notes with the Federal reserve banks and other financial institutions they are to become the avenues through which credit will flow from its sources to the farms.
4. National farm-credit banks, in furnishing credit for the local society, will rely (1) upon their capital, (2) upon deposits from individuals or the Federal Government, (3) upon the sale of debentures, and (4) upon rediscounting the notes of the farmers, when indorsed by local societies, with the Federal reserve banks and other banking and financial institutions.
5. Each national farm-credit bank will be primarily liable for its own debts and debentures, but in case of a failure of any one of such banks all other such banks will be required to contribute to prevent loss to its creditors.

#### FEDERAL FARM-CREDIT SOCIETIES.

The chief features of the local Federal farm-credit societies may be outlined as follows:

- First. They will be corporations, operating in restricted areas, serving a limited farm population, controlled by borrowers, and managed by a board of five directors, with a president, vice president, and secretary-treasurer, who will be the only paid official.
- Second. They will not be banks receiving deposits or doing a general banking business, but will be credit societies, utilizing the local commercial banks for depositaries.
- Third. Exclusive of the capital subscribed by borrowers, each society will have a minimum working capital of \$5,000, which, if not otherwise subscribed, will be furnished by the Federal Government.
- Fourth. Each borrower will be required to subscribe to the capital of the local society in an amount equal to one-tenth of the loan granted, which may be paid for out of the proceeds of the loan, and on the payment of the note such stock may be canceled and the face value thereof credited on the note.
- Fifth. Local societies are authorized to charge one-half of 1 per cent per annum interest in excess of the interest rate which

the regional bank charges the local society, and from this margin will be expected to meet administrative expenses and be able to pay dividends on stock held by borrowers sufficient to offset the interest paid by them on money invested in the stock held in the local society, but no dividends will be paid on stock held by the Government.

Sixth. Local societies will make loans on their own account entirely independent of the regional bank, and will thus be in a position to transact business promptly and to close loans without delay.

Seventh. Local societies, in borrowing money from regional banks or in having their notes discounted thereby, will subscribe to the capital stock of the regional bank in an amount equal to one-tenth of the credit extended by the regional bank.

Eighth. Shareholders in local societies are liable for the debts of such societies only to the amount of stock held; but the principle of the unlimited liability, practiced by many of the European short-term farm credit societies, will apply as between societies, so that in case of the bankruptcy of a local society all other societies will be required to contribute to prevent losses to creditors.

Ninth. Local societies are made exempt from local or Federal taxation, are prohibited from charging an interest rate in excess of 6 per cent per annum, and all loans must be secured by the signature of two responsible indorsers, or by chattel mortgage, or by bonds or other adequate collateral security.

#### IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE.

Under the provisions of my bill, H. R. 14367, the Federal farm credit societies in one particular differ radically from the local credit societies under European short-term or personal farm credit systems. In Europe, local farm credit societies receive deposits and do a general banking business. Under my bill local Federal farm credit societies are not authorized to receive deposits or conduct a general banking business. There should be some good reasons if this proposed change should be adopted. I desire to call attention to some of these reasons:

To permit local farm credit societies to receive deposits and conduct a general banking business—

- (1) Means a duplication of banking institutions in almost every community in the land.
- (2) It will require local credit societies to invest much larger capital in real estate, buildings, furniture, and equipment.
- (3) It will greatly enlarge the expense of operating, managing, and maintaining these societies, and all such expense must fall upon the borrowers.
- (4) It will mean greater cost to the Federal Government in their supervision, regulation, and control.
- (5) It will make the business of the societies more difficult, complex, and intricate, will require greater skill and efficiency in the management thereof which will again mean higher priced salaries and greater administrative expenses.
- (6) A credit business based upon deposits increases the danger of failure and financial difficulties.
- (7) It would mean direct competition for deposits with local commercial banks in every community, and this might develop antagonism which might result disastrously or injuriously to either or both.

In presenting a plan for short-term farm credit in which the local credit societies will not be banks of deposits, I wish to state that I am not antagonistic to a system based upon local credit societies or banks authorized to receive deposits. I would certainly heartily support such a system if it should be made to appear that it would best serve the interests of the farmers and promote to the greatest extent the prosperity and expansion of agriculture. This is the logical and natural position for me to take, believing, as I do, that the general welfare of all classes of our people and the very strength of this Republic depend upon the prosperity of our farmers and the growth and development of agriculture.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MORGAN. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman on this subject, and trust that the matter will receive careful consideration. I suppose that to some extent the action will depend upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the pending cases?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not certain as to that. The constitutional authority of Congress to establish a system of short-term farm credit might be an entirely different legal question from the one involved in establishing a system of farm mortgage credits as was done under the Federal land-bank act approved July 17, 1916.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand; but the same question will apply to the new system as applies to the old.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think the conclusion of the gentleman necessarily follows. An entirely different constitutional question might arise.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not intend to express the opinion that the court will condemn the present system. I hope the court will sustain the present system. I would like to say this further to the gentleman, that the ablest discussion I have seen in support of the power of Congress to enact any legislation of this character is contained in a brief filed in one of the Supreme Court cases by Judge Charles E. Hughes.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, whatever may be the decision involving the constitutionality of the Federal land-bank act, which established a system of long-time farm mortgage credit, I feel sure it will not mean the entire overthrow of the system. It may be some amendments to the act may be necessary. I feel sure Congress will find some way to remedy any defect in the act. Furthermore, the importance of providing the farmers of the United States with a system of credit suited to the needs of the great fundamental industry of agriculture is so great that if necessary the Constitution itself should be amended.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I will gladly yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas, whom I know is deeply interested in the welfare of the farmers, not only of his own district but the entire Nation.

Mr. TINCHER. As I understand the gentleman, that portion of the agricultural loan bill to which the gentleman from Oklahoma has referred, the idea is to work out some system by which the farmer may have short-time credit without paying, as he is compelled to pay to-day, one and one-half or sometimes twice the rate of interest that men engaged in commerce pay for short-time loans.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Kansas has the correct idea. It is true, as the statistics show, that as a rule commercial, manufacturing, and mercantile interests borrow money at a lower rate than the farmers. So one of the chief objects of enacting the Federal farm-loan act, which established a system of long-time farm mortgage credits, was to reduce the rate of interest the farmers were compelled to pay. But another object was to provide the farmers with better credit facilities, to furnish them more abundant credit, and to furnish it to them on more favorable terms and conditions. But as I have pointed out, the Federal land-bank act provides only for long-time farm mortgage credit. This can be utilized only by farm owners. The tenant who has no farm can not borrow money under the existing system. More than that, all the farmers need credit or what is known as short-time or personal credit. For this kind of credit they, in many cases, pay excessive rates of interest. The object of the proposed new system of short-term farm credit is to make interest rates lower for such credit, and provide them this credit on terms and conditions suitable to their business. Another object is to standardize interest rates to the farmers, and to provide equal credit facilities to the farmers throughout every section of the Nation. Uniformity of interest rates and equal credit facilities to the farmers in all the various sections of the United States can never be attained except through a national system of rural credits combining both the long-time or farm-loan credit and the short-time or personal credit.

#### LIMITATION OF FARM CREDIT.

The credit available to the farmer is circumscribed. Whatever credit he obtains on short-time loans he must secure from the local banker or the local money lender. His financial standing is unknown outside of the community or county in which he resides. If he secures a loan at all, he must go to his local banker and accept it on the terms and at the price he offers it. The object of short-term farm-credit institutions is to bring the average farmer in touch with credit resources outside of his own immediate community or county.

Every farm is a factory in which credit is manufactured. But the output of this credit factory is chiefly consumed in our towns and cities. Every farm is a spring from which credit flows. But the rivulet of credit flows away from the farm. It unites with rivulets of credit from other farms. Joined together they make a stream of credit which flows along the currents of trade, commerce, and business. In every town and city a reservoir of credit is impounded. The greater centers of trade and commerce constitute the chief credit reservoirs of the Nation.

There must be some effective way of tapping these great reservoirs of credit and distributing the credit impounded therein among the farmers of the United States.

#### STANDARDIZING FARM SECURITIES.

One object of creating a system of short-term farm credits is to standardize negotiable instruments given by the farmers. The farmers secure their credit individually. There is no co-operation among them in securing credit. There is no unification in their credit power. Every farmer's note under the present system must stand or fall by itself. If we establish a national short-term farm-credit system, every promissory note on which credit is given in that system becomes standardized in value. This is true because borrowers become liable for each other, either on a limited or an unlimited liability. Experience has shown that either system is safe. I believe that borrowers should assume only a limited liability for each other. But I believe that the local societies as between each other should assume an unlimited liability. The regional banks should likewise be bound together by unlimited liability for each other's obligations. We have then a system, and the whole structure will stand or fall together. However humble the farmer may be, when his note has been accepted and indorsed by the local society it becomes gilt-edge paper.

#### REDISCOUNTING BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

One of the provisions which may develop controversy is that contained in section 9 of the bill, which authorizes any Federal reserve banks to rediscount the notes of farmers when indorsed by the local society and the regional bank. This provision, I believe, is sound in principle and eminently just to the farmers and to our greatest industry—agriculture. Its adoption, in my judgment, would not introduce any element of danger in our national currency system. At present agriculture does not receive the aid from our national banking and currency system that such system extends to the great industrial and commercial interests of the Nation. This not only restricts the growth of agriculture, but it discriminates against the farmers, who constitute more than one-third of our population.

The plan to have the Federal reserve bank rediscount the notes of farmers, when indorsed by a local credit society and a regional bank, is supported by very high authority in Europe. France has a system of short-term credit institutions corresponding almost identically with the plan of H. R. 14367, introduced by me. The local credit societies in the French system are known as the Credit Agricole Mutuel. Above the local credit societies there were in 1912, 98 regional banks, at least 1 in each State or Province. The local societies secure funds by indorsing their paper and having the same discounted at the regional banks, which in turn rediscount the same with the Bank of France. Referring to the short-term farm-credit system in France and the workings of the institutions created to promote such credit, Hon. Myron T. Herrick, in his book entitled "Rural Credits," on pages 335 and 336, says:

The regional banks are authorized to discount the negotiable instruments made by members of the local societies and indorsed by such societies and also to make loans to such societies for working funds. The paper having thus three signatures, those of the borrowing farmer, the local society, and the regional bank, is "bankable according to the commercial and banking code, and the regional bank may rediscount it at the Bank of France or at any other of the big credit institutions in France, provided the time is not over nine months."

In Senate Document No. 214, Sixty-third Congress, entitled "Agricultural Cooperation and Rural Credit in Europe," pages 651 and 653, inclusive, there is a statement made by M. Aupetit, chief of the department of economic studies to the Bank of France, relative to the Bank of France and the aid it renders the farmers. He says:

The Bank of France assists agriculture in three ways, which should be distinguished. First, it facilitates the individual agriculturists in securing loans and discounts. Second, it makes possible the success of agricultural credit banks and facilitates the rediscount which they offer the commercial banks. Third, it provided the Government with funds in the form of an advance and an annual grant with which to supply the needs of the agricultural credit banks.

Again he says:

The Bank of France also makes every effort to assist the local banks, and has given pioneer assistance to the local credit banks. These local credit banks, as has been explained, have two functions. In the first place, they act as independent banks so far as their capital and deposits are concerned. The advance made by the State enables them to act as independent banks. As soon as the credit demands of their clients exceed their own resources, they render assistance to their members by rediscounting their bills at the Bank of France through the medium of the regional bank. While these banks usually rediscount with the Bank of France, it should be understood that they are free to rediscount them with any other bank they may select. \* \* \* At the present time the Bank of France conducts regular discounting business with all of the 100 regional banks, and through them with more than 3,000 of the local cooperative credit banks. The third way in which the Bank of France assists agricultural credit in France is by granting large sums to the Government to be used to finance the local and regional credit banks.

#### SHORT-TERM FARM CREDIT IN GERMANY.

In Germany there are two chief systems of short-term co-operative credit institutions. One is the Schulze-Delitzsch sys-

tem and the other is the Raiffeisen system. The latter is the largest factor in furnishing short-term credit to the farmers of Germany. In each of these there are local credit societies, State, provincial, or regional institutions, and a large central bank. In the Raiffeisen system the central institution is the Central Agricultural Loan Bank, which has 13 branches, which serve as regional banks and through which the local societies do business. The central institution, which serves the local credit societies, which do not belong to the Raiffeisen system, is the Prussian Central Cooperative Bank of Berlin, which Prussia founded and endowed with a capital of \$18,000,000.

Taking the short-term farm credit systems of France and Germany as the best models from which to copy our system of short-term farm credit, we must have, first, local credit societies; second, regional banks of some kind, with which the local societies will do business; and, third, some kind of a central institution of large capital and resources, which will bring the individual farmer, through the local societies and the regional banks, in touch with the great reservoirs of credit of the Nation. We must follow France, which utilizes the Bank of France for this purpose, or we must follow Germany, which has created and endowed a great central institution for this purpose. I believe the French policy is the better one. Our Federal reserve banks, in their position in our banking and currency and credit system; occupy the same position that the Bank of France occupies in the banking, currency, and credit system of France. I am, therefore, in favor of making our Federal reserve banks an important factor in providing suitable short-term credit to the farmers of the United States, and thus giving the 6,500,000 farmers of the United States a front seat in our great national banking, currency, and credit system.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to interrupt the gentleman, because there might be some misapprehension from the question asked by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER], to the effect that farmers were paying one and one-half times as much as is charged for commercial credits. Now, that condition may exist locally, but the agricultural paper in South Carolina—I do not know how it is elsewhere—is about the lowest grade paper that the banks get. They are preferred in the Federal reserve banks, being given 180 days instead of 90 days, and the banks are glad to get the paper. It is a splendid paper and therefore does not have any preferential rate against it, but rather a preferential rate for it.

Mr. REAVIS. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Reserve Board quite recently, within the district that is controlled by the Kansas City banks, has issued an order whereby cattle paper is refused, and they will not rediscount that paper, and as a result of that herds running into the hundreds of thousands are being put on the market to-day because they can not finance their proposition, and it is going to produce a marked shortage?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I hope my friend will fix it so that hard-up Members of Congress will be able to get some money at a reasonable rate. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCER. Will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. TINCER. Is not the gentleman also aware of the fact that the Federal reserve bank at Kansas City, Mo., located in a purely producing section of this country, is the only Federal reserve bank that has availed itself of the authority granted to it to put in what they call a graduated rate of interest and raise the rate of interest?

Mr. MORGAN. I assume the gentleman from Kansas is correct in his statement. I wish now to present a few fundamental propositions.

#### FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

Before an architect can draw plans and specifications of a building he must have in his mind the general outlines of the proposed structure. Before we can intelligently construct our short-term farm-credit system we must have in our minds the general principles on which it shall be founded. Our short-term farm-credit institutions should be national in their origin, in their aim, in their scope, and in their character. Nothing worth while can be accomplished through State institutions. In my judgment, it would be most unfortunate to leave this great undertaking to the States. Our short-term farm-credit institutions should be authorized by Federal legislation, supervised, regulated, and, in part, controlled by Federal authority, and, furthermore, the Federal Government should render such direct financial aid as will insure their prompt organization and their successful operation.

These institutions should be altruistic and unselfish in character. Their aim should be to carry out a great national policy, world-wide in its influence. Greed and gain should have no

place in their management. They should be an unselfish intermediary through which credit is to be conveyed to the farmers. No place along the line should private capital be allowed to take toll. Their profits and earnings must be returned to the farmers, the source from which they came. They must be modeled after the mutual savings banks in New England, which are operated solely for the social, moral, and economic benefit of their 8,000,000 depositors.

These institutions should provide equal credit facilities, and like terms and uniform rates of interest, to the farmers of every State in the Union. They must serve all sections alike. There must be no discrimination in the distribution of their benefits. In their operation and management there must be no favoritism nor sectionalism. Nothing else is fair or just and nothing else will be satisfactory or successful. From all beneficiaries must be required equality in responsibility, in obligation, and in contributions; and with these the institutions must give to all equality in privileges, in benefits, and in blessings.

Above all, these institutions must be safe and sound; we must have no "wild-cat" system of short-term farm credits. These institutions must be built on bedrock principles. They must be able to withstand the severest financial storms which may beat upon them. There must be no fear of their failure or bankruptcy. They must have the implicit confidence of the investing public. Whatever other defects they may have, let them be so planned, constructed, managed, and controlled that there shall never be any question about their safety, soundness, or solvency.

They will not be charitable organizations. Their purpose will not be to make gifts, to bestow alms, or to distribute donations. They will be business concerns. They will be conducted on business principles. Their design will not be to encourage idleness, idleness, or slothfulness. Their object will be to promote thrift, to develop energy, and to encourage industry. Their mission will be to make our farmers more independent and self-reliant, to give them new courage, hope, ambition, and a brighter vision of the future.

#### CONCLUSION.

More than 40 per cent of our population reside upon the farms. Nearly one-half of the permanent annual wealth added to the Nation is the product of the farm. We have more than 31,500 banks. They have a "banking power" estimated at \$45,000,000,000. Only a comparatively small percentage of the "banking power" of this country is utilized to promote the prosperity of our farmers. The lion's share goes to trade, commerce, manufacturing, and transportation—to business men, speculators, corporations, and middlemen. The bulk of our multimillionaires have acquired their fortunes through the use of credit. Sound public policy requires the enactment of legislation that will distribute the credit power of the Nation equitably among the industries which produce it. Agriculture must have its share. More abundant credit must be made available for the farmers. The National Government, through Congress, and the State governments, through legislative assemblies, must bring into existence credit institutions, credit instrumentalities, and credit machinery that will place within the reach of our farmers such credit facilities as will enable them to expand their business, increase their profits, multiply their wealth, and bring a larger measure of well-being and happiness to them and their families.

#### REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks which I have just made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks just made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### APPENDIX.

The following is a copy of bill H. R. 14367:

A bill (H. R. 14367) to provide short-term credit for the farmers of the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the short title of this act shall be "The national farm credit act." Its administration shall be under the direction of the Federal Farm Loan Board, which shall have the same power of supervision and control over national farm credit banks and Federal farm credit societies created under this act that it has over Federal land banks and national farm loan associations created under the "Federal farm loan act." The provisions of said last-named act, in so far as they may be applicable and not in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby reenacted and made applicable to national farm credit banks, Federal farm credit societies, their directors, officers, assistants, clerks, and other employees, and the provisions of sections 29, 31, 33, and 34 of said act are hereby specifically reenacted and made applicable as aforesaid.

The Federal Farm Loan Board shall fix what proportion of the expense of operating the Federal land bank and the national farm credit bank of each Federal land bank district shall be paid by each of said banks.

## DEFINITIONS.

SEC. 2. That the term "farm-credit debenture" shall be held to include all debentures secured by collateral security deposited with the farm-loan registrar under the terms of this act; the terms "national bank" and "national banking association," used in this act shall be held to be synonymous and interchangeable; and the term "member bank" shall be held to mean any national bank, State bank, or bank or trust company which has become a member of one of the reserve banks created by the Federal reserve act approved December 23, 1913.

## FARM-LOAN REGISTRAR.

SEC. 3. That the farm-loan registrar of each Federal land bank district shall bear the same relation to the national farm credit bank of said district and the issue of farm-credit debentures that he now bears to the Federal land bank of said district, and in connection with the issue of farm-loan bonds, and said registrar shall exercise similar powers and perform similar duties relative thereto in addition to the duties specifically prescribed herein.

## NATIONAL FARM CREDIT BANKS.

SEC. 4. That there is hereby created in each Federal land bank district a national farm credit bank, and its principal office shall be located in the same city and in the same building wherein the Federal land bank of said district is located.

The directors of each Federal land bank at the time of the passage of this act shall be the temporary directors of the national farm credit bank in the Federal land bank district wherein such national farm credit bank is located. They shall give such bonds, receive such compensation as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe, and from their number the Federal Farm Loan Board shall choose a president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer of said board. Thereafter each national farm credit bank and each Federal land bank located in the same Federal land bank district shall be under the management of the same directors, who shall utilize, so far as practical, the same officers, attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees in the management of the business of said banks.

The said temporary directors shall make an organization certificate, containing in substance that which is required in the organization of Federal land banks as provided in section 4 of the Federal farm loan act, and upon duly making and filing of said organization certificate the bank shall become as from the date of the execution thereof a body corporate, and as such and in the name designated in said certificate shall have the same powers as are conferred upon Federal land banks in the aforesaid section 4 of said "Federal farm-loan act," and such additional powers as may be herein granted.

Thereafter the board of directors of every Federal land bank and of every national farm-credit bank shall be selected as hereinafter specified and shall consist of nine members, each holding office for three years. Six of said directors shall be known as local directors, three of whom shall be chosen by and be representative of national farm-loan associations, and three of whom shall be chosen by and be representative of Federal farm-credit societies. The remaining three directors shall be known as district directors and shall be appointed by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and shall represent the public interest. Any provision in section 4 of the Federal farm loan act in conflict with the provisions of this paragraph is hereby repealed. No director, officer, or employee of any kind or character shall have any increase in his salary or pay beyond 10 per cent increase by reason of being in the service of both the said banks, unless authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and such salary or pay shall be apportioned equitably between the two banks which said directors, officers, or employees respectively serve.

## CAPITAL OF NATIONAL FARM-CREDIT BANKS.

SEC. 5. That every national farm-credit bank shall have, before beginning business, a subscribed capital stock of not less than \$2,000,000, divided into shares of \$5 each. That the provisions of section 5 of the Federal farm-loan act relative to subscriptions to the capital stock of Federal land banks, in so far as the same may be applicable, are hereby made applicable to subscriptions to the capital stock of national farm-credit banks.

If within 30 days after the opening of subscription books therefor any part of the minimum capital stock of \$2,000,000 shall remain unsubscribed, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe the balance thereof on behalf of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to take out shares corresponding to the unsubscribed balance and pay for the same out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

## RESERVES AND DIVIDENDS.

SEC. 6. That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe what proportion of the net earnings of national farm-credit banks shall semi-annually be carried to the reserve account, what amount of reserve shall be maintained before dividends shall be paid, and prescribe at what time notes upon which payment of either interest or principal is in default shall be deducted from the assets thereof, and how the reserves of such banks shall be invested and safeguarded.

## REPORTS.

SEC. 7. That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall annually make a full report of its operations and of the business, financial condition, assets, expenditures, number of employees, their salaries, and other appropriate information of each of the national farm-credit banks. Said report shall be made to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall cause the same to be printed for the information of Congress.

National farm-credit banks shall make quarterly and annual reports to the Federal Farm Loan Board, including such information as shall be required by said board.

## POWER OF NATIONAL FARM CREDIT BANKS.

SEC. 8. That every national farm credit bank may receive deposits, pay interest thereon, borrow money, loan its funds to Federal farm credit societies, discount and rediscount the notes of said societies and the notes of their shareholders, issue and sell debentures as provided in this act, and do and perform such other acts as may be authorized by law.

## DISCOUNT BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

SEC. 9. That upon the indorsement of any member bank of the Federal Reserve System, or of any national farm credit bank, any Federal reserve bank may rediscount notes taken by any Federal farm credit society in the usual course of business, or the notes of such society which have a maturity, at the time of discount, of not more than six months.

## GOVERNMENT DEPOSITARIES.

SEC. 10. That all national farm credit banks organized under this act, when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be depositaries of public money, except receipts from customs; they may also be employed as financial agents of the Government, and as such depositaries and agents shall perform all such reasonable duties as the Government may require.

Said banks may loan to Federal farm credit societies such percentage of Government deposits as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and under such conditions and regulations, with reference to the security thereof, as said Secretary may prescribe to insure the payment thereof.

## SPECIAL DEPOSIT FOR LOAN PURPOSES.

SEC. 11. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to deposit with national farm credit banks a sum of money not to exceed in the aggregate \$12,000,000 in any one calendar year to be loaned by said banks to Federal farm credit societies in such amounts, at such rates of interest not to exceed 5 per cent per annum, with such security and under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

## FARM CREDIT DEBENTURES.

SEC. 12. That any national farm credit bank may issue farm credit debentures under the terms of this act, with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, when application therefor is made through the farm loan registrar. With said application said bank shall tender the said registrar, as collateral security, the indorsed notes of Federal farm credit societies or United States Government or Federal farm loan bonds, duly assigned to said registrar, not less in aggregate amount than the sum of the debentures proposed to be issued.

On approval by said board for an issue of farm credit debentures the said registrar shall proceed as soon as practicable thereafter to procure the proper execution of said debentures and the delivery thereof to said bank. The notes or bonds accepted as collateral security for the issue of farm credit debentures shall be assigned to said registrar in trust, reserving the right of substitution, and shall be held by him as collateral security for the payment thereof.

The Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe rules regulating the redemption of said notes or bonds, allowing the right of substitution of other similar notes and bonds for any portion thereof, and for the safeguarding of such securities in the hands of the registrar.

Debentures issued by any national farm credit bank shall not exceed the amount of collateral security pledged therefor, or be more than ten times the amount of the capital stock of said bank, and it shall be the duty of the registrar to enforce this provision.

The debentures shall be issued in denominations of \$10, \$25, \$50, \$100, \$500, and \$1,000; shall run for such time as may be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board; shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed 5 per cent per annum; shall be in such form in series of such amounts as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe; and may be issued as coupon bonds with coupons for interest payments attached, or as registered bonds, and the same shall be interchangeable.

That the provisions of the Federal farm loan act relative to the preparation, engraving, and delivery of farm loan bonds are hereby made applicable to farm credit debentures.

## LIABILITY OF NATIONAL FARM CREDIT BANKS.

SEC. 13. That every national farm credit bank issuing farm credit debentures shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall also be liable, upon presentation of farm credit debenture coupons, for interest payments due upon any farm credit debenture issued by any other national farm credit bank, and remaining unpaid in consequence of the default of such other national farm credit bank; and every such bank shall likewise be liable for such portion of the principal of farm credit debentures, so issued, as shall not be paid, after the assets of any such other national farm credit bank shall have been liquidated and distributed: *Provided*, That such loss, if any, either of interest or of principal, shall be assessed by the Federal Farm Loan Board against solvent national farm credit banks liable therefor in proportion to the amount of farm credit debentures which each may have outstanding at the time of such assessment.

Every national farm credit bank shall be primarily liable for all its contracts, debts, liabilities, and financial obligations of every kind and character; and every such bank shall likewise be liable for such portion of the debts, liabilities, and financial obligations of any other such bank which shall not be paid after the assets thereof shall have been liquidated and distributed: *Provided*, That such losses, if any, shall be assessed by the Federal Farm Loan Board against solvent banks liable therefor in proportion to the amount of their capital stock at the time of such assessment: *Provided further*, That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall, by order duly made, create and establish a guaranty fund to which all such banks shall be required to contribute an equitable amount annually, the amount to be fixed by said board, and from which shall be paid any of the debts, liabilities, and financial obligations of any such bank after the assets thereof shall have been liquidated and distributed; but the creation of such guaranty fund shall in no way relieve any such bank from its liability to make further contribution under any assessment which shall be made by the Federal Farm Loan Board under the provisions of this section.

Every national farm credit bank shall, by specific provision in its organization certificate, and by appropriate action of its board of directors, duly recorded in its minutes, obligate itself to become liable as provided in this section.

Farm credit debentures shall be signed by the president of the bank issuing the same and attested by its secretary, and contain such other matter as may be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

Coupon or interest payments upon debentures shall be payable at the national farm credit bank by which they were issued, in gold or lawful money, and on payment shall be duly canceled by said bank. The Federal Farm Loan Board may authorize such payment at any national farm credit bank or at any other bank.

The Federal Farm Loan Board may by rule and regulation not inconsistent with the provisions of this act further regulate and control the issue, terms and payment of farm credit debentures and the application of payments made thereon.

## FEDERAL FARM CREDIT SOCIETIES.

SEC. 14. That corporations to be known as Federal farm credit societies may be organized by 10 or more natural persons under the provisions of this act and under such rules, regulations, and certificate

of incorporation as shall be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board. The principal office of the first Federal farm credit society organized in any county shall be located at the county seat of the county in which it is organized, and incorporators thereof shall be actual residents of said county. Only one Federal farm credit society shall be organized in any county unless special permission therefor shall be granted by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

The application for incorporation shall be made to the Federal Farm Loan Board. It shall be made in duplicate, shall be in such form and contain such matter as shall be prescribed by the said board, and among other things shall specify the officers and directors to serve until the first annual election of such officers. If any such application shall be proper in form and shall meet the requirements prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board as aforesaid, the same shall be approved by said board and said board shall issue to said society a certificate of incorporation, and the society shall become, as from the date thereof, a body corporate, and as such in the name designated in its certificate of incorporation it shall have power—

First. To adopt and use a corporate seal.

Second. To have succession until it is dissolved by act of Congress or under the provisions of this act.

Third. To make contracts.

Fourth. To sue and be sued, complain, interplead, and defend, in any court of law or equity, as fully as natural persons.

Fifth. To elect and appoint directors, and by its board of directors to elect a president, and vice president, and appoint a secretary-treasurer and such other officers and employees as may be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

Sixth. To prescribe by its board of directors, subject to the regulations of the Federal Farm Loan Board, by-laws not inconsistent with law.

Seventh. To exercise by its board of directors, or duly authorized officers or agents, all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business of such society as herein authorized.

Eighth. To acquire and dispose of such property, real or personal, as may be necessary or convenient for the transaction of its business.

Ninth. To indorse, and thereby become liable for the payment of notes taken from its shareholders, to loan its funds to shareholders who are actively engaged in agriculture, for productive purposes only; to borrow money; and to transact such other business and perform such other acts as shall be provided in this act.

#### DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS.

SEC. 15. That Federal farm credit societies shall be managed by a board of five directors, who shall be named in the certificate of incorporation and who shall serve until the first annual meeting of shareholders and until their successors shall be elected and qualified.

By a majority vote, such directors shall elect a president, vice president, and secretary-treasurer of said board. After the first annual meeting of such society, directors shall be elected by a majority vote of its shareholders. In such election, and in all other business before the shareholders, each shareholder shall have but one vote. The secretary-treasurer may not be a director or shareholder in said society. Directors shall be citizens of the United States, residents of the State and county in which such corporation is located, and shall be persons actively engaged in the business of farming. They shall give such bonds as shall be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

The duties of directors and officers of Federal farm credit societies shall be such as are prescribed herein and such as usually pertain to directors and officers of national banking associations.

It shall be the duty of the secretary-treasurer of every Federal farm credit society to act as custodian of its funds, notes, securities, papers, records, and other property. The board of directors shall designate some State or national bank as the depository of the society. The secretary-treasurer shall deposit all the funds of the society in such depository and provide, either in such depository or elsewhere, some safe and secure place in which he shall keep the notes, securities, records, and papers of such society. He shall receive such compensation as shall be fixed by the directors, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

#### DEPOSITORIES; LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS.

SEC. 16. That every member bank of the Federal Reserve System, when designated as the depository of any Federal farm credit society, is hereby required to act as such, and every State bank, when so designated, may act as such.

Any bank acting as the depository of a Federal farm credit society shall pay such interest on the deposits of such society as shall be agreed upon. Every national or other bank is authorized to make loans to any Federal farm credit society on such terms and security as may be agreed upon, and any State bank may make loans to the society when the same is not in violation of the laws of the State in which it is located.

Every national or other bank is authorized to act as secretary-treasurer of any Federal farm credit society, through one of its officers so designated, and any State bank may so act when not in conflict with the laws of the State in which it is incorporated, and any officer of said banks may so act.

#### SUPERVISION.

SEC. 17. That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall have and provide for careful supervision and examination of Federal farm credit societies and is authorized to make special rules and regulations to insure economical administration thereof.

#### REPORTS.

SEC. 18. That every Federal farm credit society shall make monthly, quarterly, and annual reports to the national farm credit bank of the Federal land bank district in which it is located, in such form and covering such information as shall be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

#### CAPITAL STOCK OF FEDERAL FARM CREDIT SOCIETIES.

SEC. 19. That every Federal farm credit society shall have, before beginning business, a subscribed cash capital of not less than \$10,000, exclusive of capital subscribed by prospective borrowers.

The Federal Farm Loan Board is authorized to prescribe the times and conditions of the payment of subscriptions to the capital stock, to reject any subscription in its discretion, and to require subscribers to furnish adequate security for the payment thereof.

The capital stock of each Federal farm credit society shall be divided into shares of \$1 each, and may be subscribed for and held by any individual, firm, or corporation, or by the government of any county, municipality, State, or of the United States.

Stock held by borrowers of Federal farm credit societies shall not be transferred or hypothecated, and the certificates therefor shall so state.

Stock owned by the Government of the United States in Federal farm credit societies shall receive no dividends, but all other stock shall share in dividend distributions without preference.

It shall be the duty of the directors of every Federal farm credit society, as soon as practicable after the certificate of incorporation for such society has been issued, to open books of subscription to the capital stock of said society. Every person subscribing to the capital stock thereof shall indicate whether or not he intends to become a borrower from said society. If within 30 days after the opening of said books any part of the minimum capitalization of \$10,000 herein prescribed for Federal farm credit societies, exclusive of subscriptions made by prospective borrowers, shall remain unsubscribed, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe the balance thereof on behalf of the United States, said subscription to be subject to call, in whole or in part, by the board of directors of said national farm credit society upon 30 days' notice, with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to take out shares corresponding to the unsubscribed balance as called, and to pay for the same out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

It shall be the duty of the Federal Farm Loan Board to prescribe rules, regulations, and conditions upon which the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay for said stock, and may require the directors and officers of said society to give bond or other security for safeguarding said funds.

The Government of the United States shall have no vote for the shares of stock held by it at meetings of shareholders, but the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe rules and regulations for the protection of the interests of the Government on account of stock held by it.

After the subscriptions to the capital stock of any Federal farm credit society, exclusive of the amount subscribed by the Government of the United States, shall amount to \$25,000, the stock held by the Government of the United States shall be canceled and retired, and the said Government shall be paid the par value thereof. The retirement of said stock and the payment thereof to the Government shall be made semiannually and shall cover such a period of years as shall be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

Every Federal farm credit society shall keep a certain amount of its capital stock in quick assets, the character of such assets and the amount thereof to be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board, and said board shall further prescribe for any additional reserve fund to be kept and maintained by said society.

#### LOANS.

SEC. 20. That Federal farm credit societies shall make loans only to shareholders who are farmers. No loan shall be made for less than \$10 nor for more than \$2,500 unless first approved by the national farm credit bank of the Federal land bank district in which such society is located, or for a longer time than one year. No loan shall be made to a shareholder in an amount greater than ten times the paid-up capital stock he holds in said society. The stock held in such societies by any borrower therefrom shall not be transferable and shall be held as collateral security for the payment of any loan made to such borrower, but such shareholder shall be paid any dividends accruing on said capital stock while it is outstanding. Any shareholder who has been a borrower may on his request, on payment of his note in full, have his stock canceled, and he shall thereupon be paid an amount in cash equal to the par value of his stock, or have the same applied in final payment of his note, subject to any reduction that may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of said stock to meet any impairment of the capital of any society at the time payment may be made.

Any person desiring to borrow money from a Federal farm loan society shall make written application therefor, accompanied by an agreement to purchase stock in said society equal to one-tenth of the amount of the loan granted, and may reserve the right to pay for said stock out of the proceeds of said loan. No loan shall be made except on the written approval of at least three of the directors.

The directors of any Federal farm credit society may appoint among its shareholders such committees as may be necessary to aid it in transacting its business.

Every Federal farm credit society is prohibited from incurring indebtedness for administration expenses which in any way impairs the minimum capital stock required in the organization certificate of such society.

#### DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL FARM CREDIT SOCIETIES.

SEC. 21. That every Federal farm credit society shall be primarily liable for all its contracts, debts, liabilities, and financial obligations of every kind and character; and every such society shall likewise be liable for such portion of the debts, liabilities, and financial obligations which shall not be paid after the assets of any other such society shall have been liquidated and distributed: *Provided*, That such losses, if any, shall be assessed by the Federal Farm Loan Board against solvent societies liable therefor in proportion to the amount of their capital stock at the time of such assessment: *Provided further*, That the Federal Farm Loan Board by order duly made shall create and establish a guaranty fund to which all Federal farm credit societies shall be required to contribute an equitable amount annually and from which shall be paid any of the debts, liabilities, and financial obligations of any such society after the assets thereof shall have been liquidated and distributed, but the creation of such guaranty fund shall in no way relieve any Federal farm credit society from its liability to make further contribution under any assessment which may be made by the Federal Farm Loan Board under the provisions of this section.

Every Federal farm credit society shall in its application for incorporation assume the financial liability provided in this section and its organization certificate shall so specify.

#### RESPONSIBILITY OF SHAREHOLDERS.

SEC. 22. That shareholders of every Federal farm credit society shall be held individually responsible, equally and ratably and not one for another, for all contracts, debts, and engagements of such society to the extent of the amount of stock owned by them at the par value thereof. Stock held in Federal farm credit societies shall not be transferable.

The stock held by any shareholder in any Federal farm credit society shall be held in trust by such society to meet the obligations of any shareholder as a member of said society, and shall be exempt from any

debt, judgment lien, execution, attachment, or other process issued out of any State court, or out of any court of the United States.

#### EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION.

SEC. 23. That every national farm credit bank and every Federal farm credit society, including the capital and reserve or surplus thereof, and the income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation, except taxes upon real estate held, purchased, or taken by said bank or society, under the provisions of this act.

Notes and other legal obligations executed to Federal farm credit societies, or to national farm credit banks, and farm credit debentures issued under the provisions of this act shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States, and as such they and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation.

#### FEDERAL FARM CREDIT SOCIETIES SHALL PURCHASE STOCK IN NATIONAL FARM CREDIT SOCIETIES.

SEC. 24. That every Federal farm credit society shall from time to time subscribe to the capital stock of the national farm credit bank of the Federal land bank district in which it is located in an amount equal to 10 per cent of the total credit extended to it by such bank, both through direct loans to the society or through the discount or rediscount of the notes of said society or its shareholders. Every national farm credit bank shall from time to time cancel any stock which any Federal farm credit society shall hold in any such bank in excess of the 10 per cent above provided and pay to such Federal farm credit society in cash the amount of said stock so canceled according to the par value thereof.

#### RATE OF INTEREST.

SEC. 25. That Federal farm credit societies shall not charge a rate of interest in excess of 6 per cent per annum.

National farm credit banks shall not charge any Federal farm credit society a rate of interest in excess of 5½ per cent per annum, and in no case shall any national farm credit bank charge a Federal farm credit society a rate of interest which exceeds by more than one-half of 1 per cent annually the rate of discount paid by said bank, or the rate of interest it pays on borrowed money.

#### LOAN COMMITTEE.

SEC. 26. That the president, vice president, and one other director, to be elected by the board of directors, shall constitute the loan committee of each Federal farm credit society. Said committee shall investigate and pass upon the character of each applicant for a loan, and as to the security offered therefor. No loan shall be made except upon the approval of a majority of the board of directors, and no director shall vote upon any loan in which he has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest.

#### SECURITY FOR LOANS.

SEC. 27. That Federal farm credit societies shall make loans only when satisfactorily secured in one or more of the following ways:

- (a) By the signature of two responsible indorsers.
- (b) By a chattel mortgage upon personal property worth at least double the amount of the loan.
- (c) By a chattel mortgage upon growing crops when secured also by at least one responsible indorser.
- (d) By the delivery of bonds, notes, or other securities in such amount and of such a character as shall afford ample security for the loan.
- (f) By such other security as may be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

#### REPEALING CLAUSE.

SEC. 28. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect upon its passage. The right to amend, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

MR. GANLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the merchant marine bill.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the merchant marine bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. WATKINS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the legislation just spoken of by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the subject just referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the Volstead bill.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the Volstead bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the legislation of the session.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Record on the legislation of the session. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### IRELAND.

MR. EAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House concurrent resolution 57, known as the Mason resolution, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on May 29, 1920, to the effect that the Congress of the United States views with concern and solicitude the

deplorable conditions existing in Ireland and expresses its sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of their own choice.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

MR. EAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MR. EAGAN. For several days I have been trying, as have other gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, to secure action on the Mason resolution. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. PORTER], in the debate on another bill on Thursday evening last, in response to an inquiry by me as to what his program was with regard to the Mason resolution, said that he hoped an opportunity would be given to the House to consider and dispose of it before adjournment. I am reliably informed that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee does not intend to bring up the Mason resolution. I want to know what method can be devised whereby we may have an opportunity to consider this resolution before we adjourn?

THE SPEAKER. It is difficult to pass any legislation when there is trouble in maintaining a quorum.

MR. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MR. SMITH of New York. Is it permissible at this stage, before adjournment, for a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to move the consideration of House concurrent resolution 57, just referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN], which was reported out of the committee over a week ago?

THE SPEAKER. It is not. If a question were raised as to a quorum, it might complicate matters by causing delay while the presence of a quorum was being obtained.

MR. EAGAN. We have passed other legislation here to-day, and perhaps without a quorum.

THE SPEAKER. No legislation can be passed now except by unanimous consent.

MR. EAGAN. And my request, Mr. Speaker, was for unanimous consent.

MR. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, can not that legislation—

THE SPEAKER. The Chair declines to discuss that matter any further.

#### RURAL HOMES.

MR. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 2 o'clock.

MR. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill (S. 3477) to increase, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes, is a bill of great merit which we have been waiting for several days to get an opportunity to consider. I would like to know definitely, before the recess is taken, when this bill can be taken up? I ask unanimous consent that it be taken up now.

THE SPEAKER. No legislation can be taken up now except by unanimous consent.

MR. KINKAID. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3477.

MR. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, let me direct the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to this proposition and then see whether or not he desires to call up that bill. It is a Senate bill. It has passed the Senate. Now, there is no more chance of that bill being engrossed and reaching the President in time for him to sign it before the hour of adjournment comes than there is of any other impossible thing happening. There is no chance whatever.

MR. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is a very short bill.

MR. GARRETT. If it does pass and is not signed it is dead.

MR. KINKAID. I will take the chances on that.

#### ALVIN W. WEAKLEY.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

MR. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, I shall have the floor when the gentleman from Missouri has gotten through.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 588.

Resolved, That Alvin W. Weakley be appointed special messenger to serve in and about the House under the direction of the Doorkeeper, at a salary of \$100 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until December 1, 1920.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this boy has been here housed up for five or six years. He is in very bad health, has not a dollar on earth, and if the resolution is not passed

prior to the adjournment he is off the rolls and has nothing to live on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### RURAL HOMES.

Mr. KINKAID. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the present consideration of Senate bill 3477.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 3477) to increase, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Reclamation Service, is authorized to investigate and determine the feasibility of developing farms and tracts of land in private ownership within any State or Territory, by reclamation and otherwise, for the purpose of subdividing the land and disposing of the same in farms and parcels at reasonable prices.

Sec. 2. That after the Secretary of the Interior has determined the feasibility of a project, he is authorized, through the Reclamation Service, to develop the land to such extent and dispose of the same in farms and parcels in such manner and upon such terms as to him shall be deemed most feasible and practicable.

Sec. 3. That no moneys of the United States shall be expended for any of the purposes of this act, nor shall either the investigation or development of any project be commenced or any obligation incurred therefor until a contract shall have first been made by the Secretary of the Interior with the owner or owners of the land providing for the payment in advance by the owner or owners of sufficient moneys to meet the estimated cost, and thereafter of sufficient moneys to meet the actual cost of such investigation or development, and no expense shall be incurred by the Government in excess of moneys already advanced. The moneys provided by every such contract shall be deposited with the Treasury of the United States as a trust fund, and shall be disbursed by a duly authorized fiscal officer of the Government under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with the terms of such contract.

Sec. 4. That every contract for development of a project shall provide, among other things, that the developed farms and parcels shall be sold to persons who desire to occupy the same as homes, at the actual cost of the land and the development thereof plus a definite reasonable profit to the owner or owners stated in advance therein. All contracts for the purchase of farms and parcels shall be made for, and the moneys due thereunder shall be payable to, the owner or owners of the land or their assigns.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "prices," insert the following: "lands in excess of the amount needed by the owner for his own farm and of the disposing of the remaining lands in farms and parcels of suitable size at reasonable prices"; page 2, line 3, strike out the word "land" and insert the words "farms and tracts"; page 2, line 4, strike out the word "same" and insert "surplus lands"; same page, line 5, after the word "parcels," insert the words "of suitable size."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. CANNON. What is the request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have no objection to the gentleman from Nebraska making a speech, but this proposition he suggests, if there is any objection that will prevent its being considered in these closing minutes of the session, if necessary I will make it.

The SPEAKER. The right to object is reserved.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I heartily thank the distinguished ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON] for his kindness in withholding his objection to the consideration of the bill in order that I may have time to at least outline its merits, with the hope of securing its immediate consideration. It is a Senate bill. The bill having been referred to the Secretary of the Interior by the Senate committee, he responded with a strong indorsement of all of its provisions, and a copy of that letter is contained in the report which accompanies the bill. After full discussion in the Senate the bill was passed without opposition. Our House Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which the bill was referred, has unanimously recommended its enactment.

It is not a Government land proposition, but it is lands in private ownership which is intended to be developed. It is not the Government that is going to perform the development, but the owners of private lands themselves; neither is Government money to be used for the development, but the landowners themselves must raise the money and deposit it with the Secretary of the Treasury before the Government will undertake to direct or supervise for the owners of the land the development to be made. I deem it important to here emphasize that the Government is not to expend one dollar for the development. Some of the membership inquire whether it is not another big reclamation measure; well, I will say, it is a reclamation measure, and that in a very broad sense. It is

for the reclamation of semiarid lands in the West by irrigation; it is for reclamation by the drainage of swamp lands wherever they may be found, in the East, West, North, or South; it is also for reclamation by the pulling of stumps and the clearing of such lands, and it is further contemplated that worn-out lands may be reclaimed for farming purposes by re-fertilization under the act. The provisions are not intended any more for the benefit of any one region or section of the country than another; no more for any one State than for all the rest of the States in the Union; it is contemplated that the act may be utilized in any locality of the United States where the conditions may be applicable.

Mr. Secretary Lane, in urging the importance of going forward with the development and utilization of our natural resources, in his last report said:

But in suggesting practicable steps of progress at this time I do not forget the burden of taxation which confronts our people, nor the delicate and difficult task which Congress is called upon to perform in trying to keep the national outgo within the national income. Hence I am now suggesting such constructive things as the Government may be able to do through the exercise of its powers of supervision and direction.

This bill is in accordance with the Secretary's idea. I wish to reiterate here that the Government is not going to do the developing or reclaiming of the private lands. All that the Government is going to do is to help the people to help themselves, and, in the language of the title, "thereby help to increase the opportunities of the people who do not have homes to acquire rural homes of their own." When a project is undertaken the Government will merely lend to the private landowners the assistance of the very able and experienced irrigation and drainage engineers employed in the Reclamation Service to perform the necessary engineering work under the supervision of the Director of the Reclamation Service and the Secretary of the Interior. The skill of these experienced and reliable engineers is intended to safeguard the interests of the landowners, who must furnish all of the necessary funds for the development or reclamation to be accomplished. The ascertainment of these engineers will safeguard those who furnish money for development, whether it be the landowners themselves or their mortgagees, or the purchasers of bonds issued by a district which may be formed.

But the limited time does not permit me to bring out the strong points of the bill, and I shall let it suffice to say that I regard it as a very meritorious measure.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I hope the gentleman will not object to this bill. I was on the Irrigation Committee when the matter was considered. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the farmers in my district in the last year and a half have bonded themselves to the amount of \$15,000,000, and they will try to take advantage of the provisions of this measure without a cent of cost to the Government. They want the advantage and the prestige of the experience and reputation of the Reclamation Service in supervising works of this kind.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says it is to cost the Government nothing, and yet from the reclamation fund the Interior Department, under section 2, I think, either 2 or 3—for I read the bill—can spend from the reclamation fund in the pursuance of a real estate Interior Department organization and pay from that fund all over the country.

Mr. KINKAID. Oh, will the gentleman permit me to read the clause in question?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a condition precedent to setting in operation the provisions of the act, those who desire to take advantage of it must put up the money.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection long enough to have the gentleman make a statement if he desires.

Mr. KINKAID. The statement of the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is that money of the United States may be expended for some of the purposes of this act. Now, I beg leave to read from section 3. The language is:

That no moneys of the United States shall be expended for any of the purposes of this act, nor shall either the investigation or development of any project be commenced or any obligation incurred therefor until a contract shall have first been made by the Secretary of the Interior with the owner or owners of the land, providing for the payment in advance by the owner or owners of sufficient moneys to meet the esti-

mated cost, and thereafter of sufficient moneys to meet the actual cost of such investigation or development, and no expense shall be incurred by the Government in excess of moneys already advanced.

But I call attention also to the title of the act, which reads: "An act to increase, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman read section 2?

Mr. KINKAID. Pardon me; there is not a word about funds in section 2. It is in section 3, which I have just read, that the moneys are referred to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. KINKAID. Not a cent of its own money is to be expended by the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. I object.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GEN. GRANT.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter read from the Clerk's desk, and I state the reason why I want to have it read. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMMERS], I believe on the birthday of Gen. Grant, delivered an address upon the life and character of Gen. Grant. Gen. Grant's headquarters were at Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn., my home county, just prior to the Battle of Shiloh. A great many of the people there had informal nonmilitary transactions with him.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, how many pages long is the letter?

Mr. SIMS. It is very short.

Mr. BLANTON. How many pages?

Mr. SIMS. Oh, wait a minute.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the letter contains no reflection upon the gentleman from Texas, does it?

Mr. SIMS. Oh, no. It is along the line and supplementary of what he said. Gen. Grant's headquarters were at Savannah, and the Battle of Shiloh was fought in Hardin County, 10 miles above Savannah, at Pittsburg Landing. Later his headquarters were at Corinth, Miss., the home of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLEE].

Mr. BLANTON. Why not put the letter in the RECORD?

Mr. SIMS. I have a letter here, which I ask—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SIMS. It gives the details of a personal nature with private citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SIMS. Then I will say, if the gentleman does not want to hear the letter read, it ought to be read for the information of the country, because Gen. Grant is too great a character in our country's history to be shut out, as it were, in this sort of way. I am only trying to do honor to the memory of Gen. Grant and to show how he treated private citizens over whom he had all power, which shows that he treated private citizens more as a father than as a despotic military man. I do not want to simply print it in the RECORD. If gentlemen of the North do not want to hear good things of Gen. Grant there are others who do.

Mr. GARLAND. Oh, this is just Democratic bunk.

Mr. SIMS. It is not Democratic bunk. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be read, and if there is the slightest objection to its going in the RECORD I will withhold it until gentlemen from the North are willing to know the truth about Gen. Grant.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIMS. It is going to cost you much more time than it would take to read this letter if this permission is denied.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to know whether the Chair or anyone else in the House understands what the program is. I stayed here nearly all night last night, I had a very light breakfast, and I want to stay here during the time that the House is in session to-day to see what is going on. I suggest that if there is no more business to be transacted, we would better come to some kind of an agreement about a recess.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, may I make this statement: It is expected that the budget bill will be returned from the Senate with a minor amendment at almost any time. Otherwise unanimous consent would be asked that the House stand in recess.

Mr. RAYBURN. A gentleman who has just returned from the Senate informed me that it is dead.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The hope is that it is not dead.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] may have 10 minutes in which to address the House.

Mr. SIMS. It will not take 10 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess for one hour.

Mr. SIMS. Unless I can have this letter read, there will be no more unanimous-consent requests granted. I am not asking for legislation.

Mr. GARLAND. All right, I object.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I object.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has made a very strong argument, and while I have no objection to listening to the reading of the letter, he has made a very strong argument to induce me to object.

The SPEAKER. The first unanimous consent is upon the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the gentleman from Tennessee be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess for one hour.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee have five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he hears this unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee have five minutes.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I asked a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] to withdraw his objection.

Mr. BEGG. I am not making the request; I was defending the gentleman and trying to get him to hear this request.

Mr. SIMS. I did not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee address the House for five minutes.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object. The gentleman is putting a lot of bunk into this—

Mr. SIMS. This letter is going in and we can all see what he calls bunk. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. GARLAND. After the campaign it is all right.

Mr. SIMS. It is not a matter of campaign, it is a matter of history.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have permission to extend his remarks by inserting a letter which I am reliably informed is a very eloquent tribute to Gen. Grant.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may insert in the RECORD a letter. Is there objection—

Mr. GARLAND. And not read it.

Mr. SIMS. No, sir; I am going to read it before this House adjourns.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARLAND. I will not object to that.

Mr. SIMS. Then I renew my request that the Clerk may read this letter from the desk. I will not make a speech—

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania has objected several times.

Mr. SIMS. I know, but he does not know what he is doing.

Mr. GARLAND. I do; I know who I am opposing when I object.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I was anxious to have the letter read, as many gentlemen are anxious to hear the letter read, but on account of prejudice, and, I hope, ignorance, a northern Republican, without knowing one word that is in the letter, denounces it as being Democratic bunk. I did not think any man, though a northern man and a Republican, would object to being informed as to the personal relations of Gen. Grant with private citizens of the South while commanding an invading army at and near the bloody Battle of Shiloh, but it was left to a Member of this House from the great State of Penn-

sylvania to deny to the membership of the House the benefit and pleasure of hearing the letter read from the Clerk's desk. Therefore I am driven to accept the permission given by the House to extend my remarks by printing the letter as a part of my remarks in order that it may be read by good and unprejudiced people, wholly unlike the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who, in the exercise of autocratic power, makes it necessary to do so, all because he imagines that it is Democratic bunk.

Soon after the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] on Gen. Grant, I told him how kindly Gen. Grant treated private citizens of the South while in command of hostile invading armies. I told of a particular instance that was typical. In order to be sure of the correctness of my story I wrote Judge M. H. Meeks, of Nashville, Tenn., who was formerly a citizen of my district, to give me the details as to how his father was treated by Gen. Grant, and I now incorporate his letter and make the same a part of my remarks:

NASHVILLE, TENN., May 25, 1920.

HON. T. W. SIMS,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SIMS: Your letter of the 25th instant has been duly received. The matter to which you referred in your letter occurred when I was about 8 or 10 years of age. My father's arrest by the Federal soldiers I remember distinctly. In fact, I had followed him to the front gate, where he went to see Dr. Boone and Mr. John C. Britton, neighbors, who were sitting on their horses in front of the gate at the time the arrest was made. So I was a witness to some of the facts connected with the story, and what I did not witness I have several times heard my father relate. The facts and circumstances so related by him I also remember very distinctly, and I think you will bear me out in the statement that anyone well acquainted with him would vouch for their correctness.

Soon after the Federal Army under Gen. Grant reached Pittsburg Landing, on the Tennessee River, which, as you know, is about 10 miles above Savannah, Tenn., my father was arrested by Federal Cavalry sent out from Pittsburg.

Gen. Grant's headquarters were at the home of W. H. Cherry, in Savannah, and Gen. Sherman was at Pittsburg.

My father, as you know, was a very pronounced Democrat and, if I may say it, a man of some prominence. When the question of secession was first submitted in Tennessee he voted for the State to remain in the Union; but when, after this, President Lincoln made requisition upon Tennessee to furnish soldiers to aid in crushing the rebellion, as it was termed, it fired the hearts of many Tennesseans into opposition, and when the question was submitted to a vote the second time my father made speeches for secession and voted for it. I mention this to illustrate why the few in his section called Union men reported him to the Federal authorities and had him arrested very soon after the Army reached Pittsburg Landing. Two of his neighbors, Dr. D. M. Boone and Mr. John C. Britton, were arrested at the same time, and the three were taken to Pittsburg and then by boat to Savannah.

W. H. Cherry was a consistent Union man and a highly respected citizen. He married a Miss Irwin. The Irwin family was a prominent one and thoroughly Democratic and particular friends of my father. This was the foundation for a very kind feeling which actually existed between W. H. Cherry and my father.

Soon after my father with his neighbors reached Savannah, which was in the afternoon, he managed in some way to acquaint Mr. Cherry with his situation, and at night, after he had retired in a tent, Mr. Cherry came to where he was, and kneeling down whispered to him that he had procured for him an interview with Gen. Grant at his home the next day at 10 o'clock. During the evening, and before Mr. Cherry found my father, the officers in charge of and around him requested that they—referring to the three prisoners—should take the oath of allegiance. The neighbors were willing to take the oath and, I think, did so. My father flatly refused.

At the appointed time my father was at the place of meeting the following day. Gen. Grant had given an order that he be sent to headquarters at W. H. Cherry's home.

I presume it not improper to state at this place that my father was a prominent Mason and that soon after the meeting he learned that Gen. Grant was a member of the same order. My father was introduced to Gen. Grant as Gen. Meeks. My father first explained to him in what way he came by his military title; that he succeeded Gen. R. P. Neely, of Bolivar, Tenn., as general of the militia of West Tennessee. Political discussion first ensued, my father explaining fully and in detail what his course had been with reference to secession and

how he felt about the war, during which Gen. Grant made the statement that he was as good a Democrat as my father and that he had always voted that ticket; that the only difference was that he thought his allegiance as a citizen was first due to the General Government and that my father understood that his allegiance was first due to his State; that his effort was to crush the rebellion, but that he wished it understood that he was not there to make war upon the private citizen; that the citizen who remained at home and attended to his business he was there to protect. My father took dinner with him at Mr. Cherry's, and some time after dinner my father changed the subject of conversation by saying: "Now, General, I feel that I have been with you as long as I should. While it is very pleasant, on your account, I think I should not expect to remain any longer. What are you going to do with me?" To which Gen. Grant promptly replied, "I am going to send you home." My father stated to him that it was very kind and that he appreciated it, but that the result would be that Col. Hurst would kill him when he got home. Gen. Grant said: "No; he will not. I will give you a safeguard that will protect you." My father then said: "Gen. Grant, what about my mules?" To which Gen. Grant replied: "I have not heard anything about any mules." My father then explained to him that when he was arrested those making the arrest took from him 12 fine mules. Gen. Grant told him at once that he would send the mules home also. My father then asked him, "What about my cotton?" Gen. Grant replied that he knew nothing about any cotton. My father explained to him that at the same time the soldiers had taken from him 40 bales of cotton. At this point Gen. Grant hesitated, looked at the floor a moment, and raising his head and looking directly at my father said: "I can not return your cotton. The Government needs your cotton. But I will do this: Mr. Cherry is buying cotton, and knows what it is worth. You and Mr. Cherry get together and agree upon what your cotton is worth and I will see that you get pay for it." My father told him that would be satisfactory, and it was done. During the conversation in reference to the mules and the cotton my father explained to him that the war had much diminished his force on the farm and that it would take the best effort they could make with the force at hand to provide for those around him.

Before discharging my father Gen. Grant gave him a safeguard signed by himself. I have looked everywhere for this paper, and have failed to find it, I am very sorry to say. When going home my father went by boat up to Pittsburg, and walked from there out, which is about 6 miles, and in doing so had to pass through Gen. Sherman's line. Gen. Sherman refused to let him pass the evening he reached his headquarters, but detained him until the next morning. He did not treat him kindly. A day or two after my father reached home Col. Hurst came out from Purdy with some of his men of the Sixth Regiment, stopped at the home of the closest neighbor to my father, and sent down a squad of his men in charge (fortunately for my father) of Capt. Dickerson, of Wayne County, Tenn., whom I expect you know and will remember. The house was surrounded while the family was at the breakfast table. My father was arrested and taken away, but he took his safeguard with him. In this connection I wish to state that Capt. Dickerson conducted himself as a gentleman and treated my father kindly, and it will be of some interest to you to be reminded that he supported me in my race for attorney general in 1878, and during my canvass spoke of the incident of my father's arrest and that the demeanor of my father at the time of his arrest caused him to resolve, when he learned who I was, to support me. When he reached Col. Hurst the treatment changed again. My father showed Col. Hurst the safeguard, and when he read it he turned him loose with imprecations and statements for which, I am sure, he subsequently repented.

After the Battle of Shiloh, Gen. Grant, with his army, moved on to Corinth, Miss. While there he wrote my father that it was very necessary for him to see him and to come at once. My father took with him Mr. J. A. Johnson, whom you remember—the father of Armpstead Johnson, my brother-in-law—and when they reached headquarters they found Gen. Grant alone smoking. He smoked a great deal, and at that time smoked a pipe. Immediately after the salutation my father told him he had received his letter and came in response to it. Gen. Grant said, "Gen. Meeks, I have been hearing some mighty bad things about you." My father asked him what he had heard. "I have been hearing that you were harboring guerrillas and aiding the rebellion," said Gen. Grant. My father stated to him that he had two sons in the Confederate Army, as he knew; that when they were in need of anything that he could furnish them he invariably did it; that occasionally they would cross the line and bring two or three comrades with them, hitch their horses

out in the bottom near his home, get corn and hay for them out of his barn, and that he would convey food to them and their comrades in the woods where they were staying. They would be there only a few days, and it was the only way they had to visit and see the family, and that while he was aiding the rebellion to that extent, it was true at the same time that for every Confederate soldier he fed he fed 100 for the Federal Army, not because he preferred to do so but because he had to do so, and, although not voluntary, the Federal Army got the benefit of it, and if this was harboring guerrillas he was guilty of it. After remaining with him for some time and discussing the usual questions, Gen. Grant finally delivered himself in about this way: "Well, Mr. Meeks, you go on home. Do the very best you can. I know how you are situated and you know how I am situated. We are going to win the fight, not because we are better fighters but because we have more men. When the Confederate Army loses one it has none other to supply his place. When we lose one we have three more ready to take his place. It is only a question of time. You do the best you can, Mr. Meeks. At the wind-up, should your boys be living, they may be in trouble, and if so, should I be living, I will help your boys." They then shook hands for the last time.

I wish to state further, as it bears upon the character of Gen. Grant:

My father owned slaves, and in the number was one given to him by his grandfather, Capt. John Henderson, who was a captain in the Revolutionary War. The negro's name was "Bob." He was a few years younger than my father. He was the most reliable colored man that I ever knew. He was treated like one of the family. Soon after the war began Bob asked father to furnish him a horse, that he might go to my brother, who was in the Confederate Army, and stay with him. My father did so and he went and stayed with him for months. He came home to see us, and while there the Federals came out and took him to Bethel Springs, and while there my father went to see Gen. Grant about getting Bob released. Gen. Grant told my father he could not force Bob to go back with him, but if Bob wished to go he would see that he did so. My father told him if Bob did not wish to go with him he did not want him. Gen. Grant gave my father an order to present to the colonel stationed at Bethel Springs, for whom Bob was working, directing him that if Bob wished to go back to his old home to send him back. My father presented the order to the colonel and, after reading the order, the colonel said to my father that Bob did not wish to go with him. Father said to him, "Call Bob around and ask him." He did so, and Bob said, "Yes, sir; I want to go back home." My father took him home and Bob died there in 1887. I left Jackson, Tenn., and went home to see him in his last illness, and a crowd attended his burial, both white and colored, that would do credit to almost anyone. He was sensible, industrious, and reliable. He was never chastised nor punished in his life as a slave. My father very nearly involved himself in a serious difficulty once when a white man became offended at Bob without cause and undertook to punish him. My father intervened and said to the man that he himself was in the wrong and that if he laid hands upon that negro he would have to encounter him in a very serious way, and the white man desisted.

This looks like I am giving too much space and time to Uncle Bob, but, Mr. Sims, as a matter of fact, I have a feeling for his memory that is strangely pathetic and I never miss an opportunity when the occasion will permit it not to vindicate him in every way, so far as the truth will permit.

This is presented in a somewhat desultory way and I had to get it up under difficulty, but will send it on as it is.

Yours, truly,

M. H. MEEKS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll for the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 2.15 p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2.15 p. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint, to fill the vacancy as director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, made by the resignation of Mr. PORTER of Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3.30.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Will the majority leader withhold that motion for a moment? Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Mason resolution and on legislation of the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Mason resolution and legislation of the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3.30. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

RECESS.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 3.30 o'clock p. m.)

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

BLACK WARRIOR RIVER CLAIMS—VETO MESSAGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

JUNE 4, 1920.

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4927, entitled "An act for the relief of Nancy A. Parsons, C. M. Parsons, D. F. Staggs, Ollie Staggs, Roas Staggs, Lena Birchfield, Alice Birchfield, Bertie Gwin, Greely Gilbert, and Nelson Gilbert."

This act directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of \$3,975, in certain designated proportions, to the persons enumerated in the title of the act, and recites that the sum in question is the value ascertained by condemnation proceedings in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama, in an action in which the United States was plaintiff and the beneficiaries of the act defendants, as damages to lands owned by them jointly by the construction of certain works for the improvement of navigation on the Black Warrior River.

As a result of the construction of lock and dam No. 17, Black Warrior River, about 51 acres of land belonging to Nancy A. Parsons were overflowed. The right of the owner to a reasonable compensation being recognized, the Government made an offer, which was rejected, and condemnation proceedings were resorted to in the United States district court. The case was tried before a jury, which returned a verdict of \$4,100, which the trial judge reduced to \$3,975, or nearly \$80 per acre for the land submerged. While there appears to have been no error in the legal proceedings, the final verdict in the case is plainly excessive. The land in question was assessed for taxes at \$2 per acre. The mineral rights in the property had been sold by the owners, and only about 12 of the 51 acres were cleared and in cultivation. For the most part, it consists of waste or uncleaned land which has been permitted to grow up into an old pine field, and there was nothing in its location or character to give it any special value. The War Department, therefore, requested the Attorney General to discontinue the condemnation proceedings on the ground that the award of the jury was unreasonable and exorbitant.

The accompanying act was not referred to the War Department for report previous to its passage by the Congress as is usual in such cases, and it would seem that the Congress was not in possession of all the facts which ought to be considered in determining the measure of the Government's just obligation to the claimants in this matter. That they have been injured by the work in question is conceded, but protection of the just interests of the Government would seem to require a consideration of the evidence of value before a final determination of the amount which the Government should pay.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill with the accompanying veto message be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] moves that the veto message with the accompanying bill be referred to the Claims Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 11224. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members

of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918; and

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the compensation of session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives for the month of June, 1920, on the 5th day of said month.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval the following bills and joint resolutions:

H. R. 13627. An act to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines";

H. R. 10011. An act authorizing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish monthly statistics concerning hides, skins, and leather;

H. R. 13962. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 10806. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved shore spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska;

H. R. 10378. An act to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 270. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument marking the starting point of the motor convoy from Washington to San Francisco;

H. R. 10183. An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired;

H. R. 11892. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14338. An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an adequate basis;

H. R. 13976. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 13977. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 13978. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 14335. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6407. An act for the relief of Michael MacGarvey;

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the compensation of session employees of the Senate and House of Representatives for the month of June, 1920, on the 5th day of said month; and

H. R. 11224. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 146) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Senate certain detailed information secured from income and profits tax returns of taxable year 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, your committee of the House, appointed with a like committee of the Senate, to wait upon the President and inform him that the Congress is about to adjourn and would be pleased to receive any communication he desired to make, has performed that duty, and is informed by him that the President has no further communication to make to the Congress.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE—WORK OF THE SECOND SESSION, SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress is about to pass into history with a record of diligent and intelligent consideration of the public business, careful scrutiny of and economy in appropriations, and wise, constructive, progressive legislation, unexcelled by any Congress in American history. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Entering upon its labors in the midst of conditions of unparalleled extravagance in public expenditure, faced with departmental estimates of staggering proportions, the Congress has accomplished the most remarkable economies known in all the history of governmental appropriations. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the special session of this Congress the appropriations actually made in the eight regular supply bills which had failed in the former Democratic Congress were \$940,610,598.97 below the amounts carried in the bills that failed. In the present session the Congress has effected a saving, below the administration's estimates in the 13 regular supply bills, of \$1,433,850,218.09; making a total saving below the estimates as presented and urged by the departments in the two sessions of \$2,374,460,817.06. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The program of legislation as announced by the Republican conference at the beginning of the first session of the Congress has been carried out to the letter, except as to certain bills for the protection of American industries which passed the House but, in the absence of a clear and effective working majority in the Senate, failed in that body in the face of Democratic opposition.

This program of forward-looking progressive legislation constitutes the finest record ever made in the same period by an American Congress, and embraces such important legislation as the railroad transportation act; the woman suffrage amendment; the merchant marine shipping act; the oil and coal land leasing act; the Federal water power act; the Sweet war-risk act; the act for the enforcement of national prohibition; the civil-service retirement act; the act for the vocational rehabilitation of those disabled in industry; the act for the creation of a Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor; the bill for the extension and enlargement of the Lever Act, with a view of preventing hoarding and profiteering, and with additional penalties for the violation of the statute; legislation with liberal provisions and generous appropriations for vocational training and rehabilitation of wounded soldiers and sailors; and the resolution repealing war-time legislation, except such as should remain in force until peace is officially established. These and other acts of far-reaching importance constitute a record unequalled in American history. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This has been a "porkless" Congress. No new public buildings have been authorized; no new river and harbor projects undertaken, but the public works under way and in progress have been abundantly provided for. The Congress has been particularly conspicuous for its steadfast refusal to pass the kind of measures to make the class of appropriations sometimes referred to as "pork-barrel" appropriations. But with all of its economies the Congress has provided for the proper maintenance and effective prosecution of all essential public services.

For years the country has demanded a more businesslike system of estimating and appropriation. Party platforms, the press, and enlightened public sentiment have all voiced the demand for a budget system. Such a system, carefully considered and wisely drawn, was passed and sent to the President. The most essential part of a budget system is the independent audit of the expenditure of public money. Only through an audit of expenditures in the executive departments entirely independent of the departments can we hope for that thorough scrutiny of public expenditure which is essential to efficiency and economy. With the view of accomplishing that result the budget bill provided that the two officials at the head of the independent audit could be removed only for cause and by con-

current resolution of the Congress or by impeachment. The President vetoed this measure on the ground that his prerogatives were invaded, because the President was not vested with authority to remove these officials, and thus the most essential feature of the whole budget system, that of a thoroughly independent audit of governmental expenditure. The attempt to override the President's veto, though supported by a considerable number of Democrats, failed through general opposition on the Democratic side.

An attempt to meet the President's wishes, in an earnest effort to secure budget legislation, even in an imperfect form, has, after being adopted in the House, met defeat in the closing hours of the session by the action of Democratic Senators. And thus for the moment this great reform which the Republican Congress has tried to carry out is defeated by the presidential veto. But the defeat is only temporary, for we shall pass a budget bill the first of the next session.

Before the budget failed the House of Representatives reformed its rules so as to provide for a single appropriating committee. This is the most remarkable action taken by a legislative body in self-denial with a view of economy, efficiency, and businesslike methods in American history.

Take it all in all the record of the Congress is one of which every Member of the Congress may well be proud. It is a record that commends the Congress to the favorable judgment of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I desire to commend the minority for the good and faithful work they have done in aiding in this accomplishment. [Applause on the Republican side.] A considerable portion of our legislation has been supported without regard to party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak for just a moment in a personal strain, I want to thank the Members of this Congress, on both sides, for the splendid and loyal support they have given me in the discharge of the responsibilities I have had here. If I felt I had always been as generous and as good-natured as the Members have been to me, I would be very comfortable indeed.

And now, before we part, may I suggest to gentlemen on both sides that as it is the favorite pastime of certain portions of the public to indulge in unfair criticism of the Congress I think we should not ourselves aid and abet and encourage such unfavorable and unfair criticism of the Congress by the attitude we assume. You gentlemen on this, the Democratic side, have not all agreed with all that has been done; but in a large measure you have aided and assisted in what has been done. Let me suggest that, even though you may think the majority has not entirely lived up to all of its opportunities, performed perfectly all of its duties and discharged fully all of its obligations, Members of Congress should not lend themselves, even though they be of the minority, to unfair criticism which reflects on the body as a whole and all Members alike. [Applause.]

I have served here a long time and, with many men, I know that the membership of this body is honest, faithful, devoted to the public service, and even though we may have to confess that the Congress may not have done at all times all that it might have done, or in the most perfect manner, let us remember, all of us, including the gentlemen on the minority side, that we are Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, with authority direct from and representing 110,000,000 of the best people on earth and that it behooves us to refrain from unfair criticisms of this great legislative body of the American Congress of which we are Members.

I want to thank you all for the courtesy that has been extended to me, for your kindness and consideration in the discharge of my duties here, and to wish you all a pleasant summer and a happy return to the last session of this Congress and to the new Congress. I will even wish that for the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, if their number is not increased. [Loud applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House, individually and personally, will reciprocate the cordial personal good-will expressed by the gentleman from Wyoming. They in turn will wish for him a pleasant vacation and a happy return.

But I apprehend that if the hearts of all the men in this House were searched to their innermost depths, there would be found very little spirit of praise, or agreement to the words of praise, which the gentleman from Wyoming has uttered in re-

gard to the public acts of the Congress itself. It is perhaps well that the gentleman from Wyoming made the speech which he made to this audience, because it did receive some slight ripples of applause on the Republican side, but I will venture the assertion here and now that this is the only audience in the United States in which he could make that speech and receive applause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The work of this Congress measuring up with the records of any Congress of the past? How absurd! Why, you have seldom paused in the midst of doing nothing except to do something worse. [Laughter.] This Congress assembled here more than a year ago, facing problems more tremendous than any Congress in history had ever faced, the after-war problems of a great Nation, growing out of a great World War, but, unfortunately, all of the spirit of support of the Government which had been manifested during the days of the war itself, had been laid aside when this Congress met.

From the hour that it assembled and began its labors until now the majority of this Congress have proceeded in their activities upon a predicate of hate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The inevitable result has been that upon the great things that challenged the patriotism and the intelligence of the House there has been an absolute, a humiliating, and a shameful failure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Tax laws! Why, you passed no tax laws save a few bunk, popgun bills designed to affect a small section, sometimes as much as a small congressional district, and sometimes only one or two counties in a congressional district. The last effort, I believe, to reduce the high cost of living was to lay a tax of \$1.25 on beans.

Appropriations! You measure your savings by the estimates; yet there has not been a Congress for 25 years, Democratic or Republican, that has not always cut the estimates sent by the departments. What you gentlemen need to study and what the future will develop is those new laws that you have passed, which will open up new governmental activities and bring about new avenues of governmental expenditures. We can not concur in any word of praise because this Congress, on account of the spirit that has run through it, you know and the country knows, has been a humiliating failure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SWOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BEE. On what subject?

Mr. SWOPE. Not on the bonus, but on one of our editors in Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request in regard to the speech that has just been made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is too late now for any further action in the House.

The Chair wishes to extend to all the Members of the House his thanks for the consideration and courtesy and forbearance which you have constantly shown me, and I wish you all a pleasant journey and a return here next session refreshed and invigorated. [Applause.]

The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the House stands adjourned sine die. [Applause.]

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a bill to amend article 40 of section 1624 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 807); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14295) granting a pension to Bridget Margaret Geraghty, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 14441) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Budget.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 14442) to prohibit interference with commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 14443) to amend section 1180 of the Code of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 14444) authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River connecting Wilbarger County, Tex., and Tillman County, Okla., beginning at a point in the Mrs. Eliza Littleton survey, Wilbarger County, Tex., and extending north to a point near the line between range 21 and range 22 west, township 2 south, Jackson County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 14445) for the better protection of the lives, limbs, and property of persons, their heirs, and the United States from the violence of mobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 14446) to amend the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14447) to amend the revenue act of 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Resolution (H. Res. 589) regarding the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) in relation to the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 381) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in relation to convening Congress in either House thereof in extraordinary sessions on the volition of the Members or the Members elect thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 14448) granting a pension to Minnie M. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 14449) granting an increase of pension to Isabella C. Secrest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 14450) for the relief of Morgan Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14451) for the relief of contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 14452) granting a pension to Anna Neibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 14453) granting a pension to Mary E. Finson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 14454) for the relief of Melville Van Auker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14455) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Eveland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14456) granting a pension to Arrabell Beagle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14457) granting a pension to Christian Seiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14458) for the relief of Willard F. Delano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 14459) granting a pension to Sadie Judith Tharp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 14460) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to ascertain the cost to the Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, and the amounts expended by it from December 1, 1906, to November 30, 1907, in closing and controlling the break in the Colorado River and to render judgment therefor; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4109. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Newspaper Writers' Union No. 9, urging repeal of the espionage law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4110. Also (by request), petition of Boston Lodge No. 264, International Association of Machinists, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4111. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, favoring freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4112. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of American Federation of Musicians favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4113. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York in connection with the incorporation of companies engaged in foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4114. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring passage of merchant marine bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4115. Also, petition of New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, favoring freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4116. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of El Centro Chamber of Commerce of California, favoring Townsend good roads bill; to the Committee on Roads.

4117. Also, petition of National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring increases in postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4118. By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of Samuel Nelson Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Kearny, N. J., favoring Irish freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4119. Also, petition of James T. Boyd Council, Bloomfield, N. J., favoring increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4120. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring establishment of an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4121. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, State of New York, relative to incorporation of companies engaged in foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4122. Also, petition of New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, favoring freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4123. By Mr. WRIGHT: Papers to accompany House bill 14459, granting a pension to Mrs. Sadie Tharp; to the Committee on Pensions.